



#3  
No. S-3

# Legislature of Ontario Debates

## Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

### **Social Development Committee**

Estimates, Social Development Policy

**Fourth Session, 30th Parliament**

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

---

## CONTENTS

---

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.  
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1977

The committee met at 2:05 p.m.

### ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY (continued)

**Mr. Chairman:** I see a quorum and I will call the meeting to order. Just before Ms. Sandeman starts, with your permission, I'd like to go to no later than five o'clock today. Are there any objections?

Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, even though you look at me, Ross. You're very charitable, Ross. I'll make it up to you another time.

**Mr. Conway:** You're hardly objectionable, Marvin.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Can you determine how we're going to go to deal now with the votes?

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Sandeman was in the middle of her question so I think I'd like to allow her to complete it. You were in the middle of something else.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, to be quite honest, the material that I'm dealing with could either be taken under the first vote as policy or the second vote as councils.

**Mr. Chairman:** The item is vote 2601, item 1.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I suppose that's policy, isn't it? Everything's policy. It's a very arbitrary separation; could we have this changed?

**Mr. Chairman:** We could deal with item 1, item 2 or item 3 separately, or we can merge them and keep talking.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Could we have the Chair's permission to merge them and keep talking, because I find it a very artificial distinction?

**Mr. Chairman:** Does anyone have any objections to that?

Agreed.

On vote 2601:

**Ms. Sandeman:** Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister to take a moment to introduce us to the members of her staff who patiently sit here?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I never thought about doing that. Dr. Wright, deputy minister; Hal Jackman; Joel—

**Mr. Chairman:** Joe who?

**Ms. Sandeman:** Joel who?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That says something, doesn't it? And Terry Jones, Joel Shapiro, Eileen Hammond, Peter Wiseman, Bill Wolfson, Maureen Quigley, David Bruce and John Nywening.

**Ms. Sandeman:** How do we know what they do? There are some charts, aren't there?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes. Joel, I know, is with the youth secretariat.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Would you like them individually to tell you what their responsibilities are?

**Ms. Sandeman:** Would you like them to do that?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Fine.

**Ms. Sandeman:** No? Ross is saying no. He doesn't want me to waste the time of the committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** You want to guess, do you, Ross.

**Ms. Sandeman:** We'll do the socializing afterwards.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** All right.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I would like briefly to complete my remarks on the handicapped and then spend a little time talking about the senior citizens policy field.

Yesterday I think we were having some discussion of income maintenance for the handicapped, and I think I suggested to you that we are hoping to see some reaction—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If I could, I would like to clarify the comments that I made yesterday about income maintenance. The council's



first annual report made reference to a study which the council had undertaken on income maintenance, and mentioned a target date of November 1976. However, the council did not finalize its report until 1977; hence, that February date on the front of the report. It was at that time, in February, that the council sent the report to the printer. The council decided to give wide distribution to the report and particularly to let all of the various handicapped groups across the province have an opportunity to see it so that they would know what the council was recommending on their behalf to the government.

I attended a meeting with the members of that income maintenance committee of the council on March 22, at which time we discussed the recommendations and I received my own copy. I think the question that you raised yesterday was why the recommendations of the council were ignored when we announced the increases in family benefits last week. I guess now you appreciate that the council's recommendations were received after the decision had been made on the provincial budget, which included the FBA increases.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Which still leaves the other question hanging. Will you then ask for a very quick review in light of these recommendations?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think I indicated yesterday that I have circulated the report to the five ministries that are involved in the recommendations. I am awaiting their response, and then it will be taken into consideration in the policy field.

**Ms. Sandeman:** So much of what the handicapped require to make it possible for them to live as the rest of us do, with mobility within our own homes, depends on the kind of housing that is available to handicapped people. One of the suggestions that the advisory council made was that the homes of handicapped people should be eligible for modification under the home renewal programme.

Personally, I think the response of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) was really inadequate. What he is saying, in effect is, that if you are a handicapped person and your house meets the requirements and your income meets the requirements of the home renewal programme, then you, the handicapped person, at the same time as you are having your roof replaced or whatever, if it's your floors that need repairing, then you could have risers instead of steps put in or,

if your stairs are unsafe, you can have them replaced with ramps.

[2:15]

But only handicapped people whose homes are in a sufficient state of disrepair to be eligible for OHRP and who have the income requirements would be considered. It seems to me that kind of piecemeal ad hoc approach is absolutely useless to the disabled, particularly as this programme, as far as we know, is to continue for only one more year. It seems so short-sighted to have the handicapped wait until their stairs are in bad repair to get them replaced by risers or a ramp.

What the Minister of Housing is saying here is that the ministry has no intention at all of modifying housing for the handicapped unless it comes under the OHRP programme. I really think, Madam Minister, that we have to be more aggressive than that in ensuring that the handicapped can remain in their own homes. So often the alternative is pressure on institutional facilities, which we know is undesirable for people who can remain at home; it seems so short-sighted not to have a home renewal programme for run-down housing which is what OHRP is for.

We are talking about a home renewal programme for the handicapped; this could be housing which may be in excellent condition but because the householder is a handicapped person, it needs some modifications. I can imagine, for instance, the situation in which a young couple buys a new bungalow in perfectly good repair, and not eligible for OHRP. The husband is involved in a serious car accident, becomes a paraplegic, and is confined to a wheelchair. There is no programme in place to help him modify his house as other jurisdictions have, recognizing that part of the rehabilitative process is to help people remain in their own homes and cope with a disability in their own homes. The minister's reply just wouldn't cover that kind of situation at all.

I don't want to belabour the point. I think the advisory council understands only too well the need for proper housing for the handicapped. But very little action is being taken.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Well, if I could just respond very briefly to that. I don't know if you are aware or not but the Ministry of Housing is certainly making available new housing with modification for people with disabilities; that is proving to be quite popular.



**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, that's under the OHC programme.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Yes.

**Ms. Sandeman:** But it is unnecessarily disrupting to handicapped people to have to move from their own homes if minor or sometimes major modifications could be made on their existing places of accommodation. It just seems that there is a real reluctance to follow through with the philosophy which is enunciated so often—that the handicapped must be able to live in their own homes, places which they have chosen to live in. Yet so often we say: "We will only deal with you if you will move either to a new OHC unit or into an institution." Of course, many handicapped people don't want to move into an OHC unit. Why should they? They have their own home. Their only problem is that it has three steps up to the front door and it needs a toilet on the ground floor. Do that and they could stay there.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think that's exactly what the ministry is attempting to do. One of the great problems, of course, is that many handicapped people are perhaps not aware that this is available to them, so it's incumbent upon the advisory council itself, through its member groups throughout the province, to make this information available to people, to tell them that there are programmes which will help them to stay in their own homes.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Who are the programmes administered by?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Housing has one. There are others through the rehabilitation and senior citizens bureaus of the Community and Social Services. They provide this kind of help to enable handicapped senior citizens to stay in their own homes. To chronic care patients, they provide carpeting in some instances. They provide for washroom facilities on the main floor. They help with the stairs, perhaps renovating a room as a bedroom on a main floor. All these things are in process. They are available.

**Ms. Sandeman:** That is age tested, in a sense, isn't it, for the seniors?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** For the seniors it would be, yes. Senior citizens who have physical difficulties.

**Ms. Sandeman:** The problem with so many of these programmes is that they are piecemeal and ad hoc and not readily available.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** It is very difficult to put in a general policy right through that would meet the needs of all of these individuals, whether they be just handicapped people of one age or another or senior citizens. But I am sure the advisory council will be continuing to put forward recommendations in this area.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I don't know that it is very difficult, Madam Minister. I would take you back to The Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act from Britain, which requires the following provision of services to the handicapped:

"The provision of practical assistance in the home; assistance in obtaining wireless, television or similar recreation facilities; provision of lectures, games, outings or other recreational facilities outside the home, or assistance in taking advantage of educational facilities; provision for or assistance in travelling to and from his home for the purpose of participating in any services provided in the area; provision of assistance in arranging for the carrying out of any works of adaptation in his home or the provision of any additional facilities designed to secure greater safety, comfort or convenience; facilitating the taking of holidays whether at holiday homes or otherwise; provision of meals; provision of or assistance in obtaining a telephone and any special equipment necessary to enable him to use a telephone."

The Act goes on and on talking about accessibility to buildings, universities and schools, transportation and so on—an omnibus piece of legislation that talks about all the services that are needed for the disabled, and makes provision for them wherever they may be, and makes it mandatory that these shall be provided by, in this case, local authorities. Of course, as we discussed yesterday, the first provision of that Act is that the local authorities must first find the disabled people and having found them provide the services.

I think the problem we so often run into in Ontario, with services for children, for the elderly, for the disabled, whatever, is to pick away at small pieces of the services without looking at a whole person, part of a community, part of a family, and setting our priorities on that scale.

I would like to turn to the senior citizens—the programmes and the policies for seniors. I think again we really have to look at the provision of services for senior citizens on a global basis. We should remember that most senior citizens are not in need of institutional care, and more seniors than are in need of institutional care are in institutions—which

tells us something about what we have allowed to happen—and that the major needs of seniors are the same as for all other groups in society; a reasonable income; proper accommodation; transportation; less need for employment opportunities than for younger groups because many seniors prefer to retire and enjoy their retirement; and proper health services. And very important at the moment, proper alternatives to institutional care.

The whole problem of senior citizens' income, I think, is still an issue, when so many senior citizens find themselves living on very tight incomes. They are bitter about the tax back on earnings, 100 per cent tax back. They are concerned, many of them, about the tax structure. I know that doesn't come under your purview so we won't get into that. But they are concerned, many of them. I was interested to notice that in your briefing book you ignored one of the recommendations of the senior citizens' council. You didn't even mention it.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Oh really? Which one was that?

**Mr. Grande:** One?

**Ms. Sandeman:** One. Well, there may have been others. I mean you didn't even mention it. In the first annual report of the senior citizens council, 1974-75, on page 5 they have a section on income maintenance. On the overall goals, interdependence, independence, and equity responsibility, they have some good recommendations to make to you. But on page 5 of that first annual report, they pointed out that for sometime now solid and reasonable figures have been discussed in many circles to obtain basic living costs for seniors. They note that the Hon. Marc Lalonde has requested that each province research this problem. They say: "Since time is running out for many of our 65s, the council has requested the Hon. Margaret Birch to obtain this information."

I looked in vain for some comment on that in the briefing book. You jumped immediately from their previous recommendations on income maintenance, land spec tax, and Canada Pension Plan to the section on Where You Live, subsidized housing for senior citizens, which is on the next page. Was the information obtained?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think I have a very legitimate reason for not including that. That is one of the recommendations and one of the areas of concern that they did express; they did become involved in it. At the same time, Metro Social Planning Council decided

to do a similar study on income maintenance. It was the decision of the council itself that it would just be duplicating an effort and that they could put their members of the Senior Citizens Advisory Council on to something else and await the recommendations from the Metro Social Planning Council. That's why; it was their own decision. It was a choice of their own priorities that they decided not to go ahead with the study on income maintenance.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Given the fact that the Metro study is now out, and that the Metro study suggests that OHS, GIS and GAINS payments for a couple living in Metro fall considerably below what the Metro budget suggests is necessary, do you have any comments on that?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I know that the chairman of the Senior Citizens Advisory Council took exception to some of the recommendations that came out in the Metro Social Planning Council report. I don't remember what the specifics were.

**Ms. Sandeman:** If I remember the comments of the chairman rightly, they were suggesting that perhaps the Metro Social Planning Council had included some budgetary items and allowed them perhaps a little more weight in the budget than the advisory council would have done. I studied those Metro budgets fairly carefully and it seems to me they were very realistic. They allowed for the fact that older people might like to drive a car, buy a newspaper, go to the movies and visit grandchildren. The suggestion is that in fact on the basic pensions available in Ontario, there is no money to spare after paying the average Metro rent, Hydro, food, heat, et cetera.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think that's a very general sort of statement, if you will excuse me. It might apply to certain numbers of people but, generally speaking, across the province of Ontario, I don't think that's a legitimate estimation.

**Mr. McClellan:** That's not what the inter-ministerial report says. They say that senior citizens can barely make ends meet. Again that's a direct quote. Do you disagree with your own senior officials?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I certainly feel that senior citizens in the province of Ontario today are not doing too badly.

**Mr. McClellan:** Why would the senior civil servants say they can barely make ends meet



and that they are being forced into residential care because they can achieve a higher standard of living inside institutions than they can in their own homes in own communities?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Again I think that's a very general kind of comment.

**Mr. McClellan:** Well, your people made it.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** You would have to ask them to explain that.

**Mr. McClellan:** Don't you intend to ask them to explain it? They don't employ you.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** My own observations are that today in Ontario senior citizens are receiving far more than in any other jurisdiction.

**Mr. McClellan:** It's a shame that your own officials don't agree with you.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, I don't think that's a shame at all; I think that's a very good state of affairs. I wouldn't want them all agreeing with me.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are you through?

**Mr. McClellan:** I am.

**Ms. Sandeman:** No, I am very happy for Mr. McClellan to give me some assistance here.

**Mr. Chairman:** I have a little trouble catching the voices, so I would like you to continue your presentation.

[2:30]

**Ms. Sandeman:** Okay. But I think he should feel free to get carried away, because I think what he's saying is very true.

Nobody is saying that all senior citizens in this province live in poverty; that would be unrealistic, untrue and irresponsible. But while we have a considerable number who are in severe financial difficulty, I think it is incumbent on the ministry to be concerned to answer the concerns of the advisory council about income maintenance, the concerns of the Metro council, the concerns reflected even in this very small project report on the needs of older people in Peterborough, which I mentioned to you last day and which was done on a very small sample group.

Of that small group, 17 per cent said that their present income did not satisfy all their financial needs, 16 per cent did not have enough money for any recreation or entertainment, 33 per cent didn't feel that they

were looked after fairly in the levels of pension—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Was the study called *While They Wait*? Which one was that?

**Ms. Sandeman:** I'm sorry; it's called *Getting in Touch*, an OFY project report on the needs of older people in Peterborough, done in the summer of 1975.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Oh, I see; it was one that was done locally.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, it's a local thing but I think it is very representative in view of the fact that 33 per cent of them were not satisfied with the pension levels, 17 per cent couldn't satisfy all their financial needs on their present income, 16 per cent of them didn't have money for recreation and entertainment, 33 per cent had no access to a car—and that is an interesting figure, because the question was carefully phrased. It didn't say, "Do you have a car?" It said, "Do you have access to a car?" and qualified it by saying, "In other words, is there a friend or a relative who will help you with driving?" And 33 per cent said no. That says something about the need for proper transportation for senior citizens.

While I've got this open—it's a little beyond the problem of income maintenance, but it speaks to the real needs of seniors in one representative Ontario community—11 per cent of the people questioned had problems preparing meals. They made comments like: "We get tired of cooking." "I've got no appetite lately." "Sometimes I haven't the energy to go shopping." "Cooking for one is tough." All the kinds of things you might expect. Five per cent of them don't have a cooked meal every day. That's small in numbers, I grant you, in terms of the nutritional problems that suggests, if you extrapolate that across the province—and we are a very representative city—the nutritional needs of as many as five per cent of the elderly people in this province are not looked after properly. And you could perhaps take it to the 11 per cent of people who have problems preparing meals; if it's very tiring to prepare meals or if you have trouble with shopping, your nutritional level is apt to drop.

It seems to me that the problems of income, nutrition, transportation and housing are all very much tied in together. But the basic problem for a lot of people is not having sufficient income, sufficient income to buy nutritious food and not having to put out so much on your hydro bill, which has

increased 30 per cent for the second time in two years; otherwise, you really aren't buying the food you should be buying.

There was a comment I wanted to ask you about on the advisory council's recommendations on home care, which I think is a very basic concern. The ministry has obviously recognized that if we are to keep people out of institutions, we must provide proper back-up home care services. On page 6-11 of your briefing book, the comment is made that the Ministries of Health and Community and Social Services have already undertaken a detailed analysis of the home care services available by each ministry, and explored the various alternative ways in which such programmes can be made available on a co-ordinated basis at the local level. I wonder if you're ready to share some of that analysis and alternatives with us.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think, as I indicated I guess on the opening day with regard to the section of the report on residential services as it related to seniors, a great deal of work is ongoing in that area because we decided that the first priority was the residential services for children. The work on that particular area went ahead of the seniors. But there has been a great deal of work done. I did indicate that consideration is being given at the moment that because of the complexities of that whole area we might consider possibly a green paper be distributed on the whole residential treatment for seniors concerned, which would include, of course, homemaking and home nursing.

I think I also indicated the other day, when you weren't here, that the budget for homemakers and nursing services under Community and Social Services has increased from \$5 million to \$7.763 million, an increase of \$2,763,600. Regarding the home care programme of the Ministry of Health, the budget for 1975-1976 was \$13,200,000. Including supplementary estimates, the budget was increased to \$18,680,500 for 1977-78, an increase in excess of \$10 million over a two-year period. I think that's a clear indication that the ministries recognize the need for this particular type of service to help those who would have the alternative of staying in their own home.

Ms. Sandeman: What kind of services is that extra money available for?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Homemaking and home nursing.

Ms. Sandeman: And what will be the criteria for provision?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course it's based on need, again.

Mr. McClellan: Are you saying that home-making services have been expanded?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, they have been.

Mr. McClellan: That will come as big news to the Toronto Visiting Homemakers Association, won't it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know that it would. It's been available. It's certainly public knowledge that the expansion in those programmes has taken place over the last two years.

Mr. McClellan: If you really believe that you're just totally deluded.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The figures speak for themselves.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, they do. And the staff reductions speak for themselves, and the reduction in 24-hour emergency service in the Toronto Visiting Homemakers Association speaks for itself.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Those are details that I'm sure you'll be able to speak about to the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) when they bring forward their estimates. Those are details that I just don't have available.

Mr. McClellan: It's called cutbacks.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It can hardly be considered a cutback when it's an increase of \$10 million over a two-year period. I really can't consider that much of a cutback.

Mr. McClellan: You can pretend that there have been no cutbacks all you want—you're not convincing anybody.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm not trying to convince you, Ross, I think that would probably be impossible. I'm just explaining to you the figures are there. The increase has been allocated, and \$10 million over two years hardly could be deemed a cutback in the services.

Ms. Sandeman: The report that the Council of Health did on the distribution of hospital and nursing home beds in Metro, which was the rationale apparently—although it's hard to see it within the report—for keeping



Doctors Hospital open, had some very interesting things to say on home care. This is prepared in the last few months, dated March 7, 1977, and presumably reflects the present conditions in Metro. I don't know if you have read this—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, I haven't.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I'm sure you have. "Care in the Home: The homemakers services presently organized creates another bottleneck in the system. Many patients occupying expensive beds in active treatment hospitals could be discharged and sent home if they had someone to look after them. They do not require organized home care, which is technically defined as visits from a doctor, nurse or physiotherapist, but they do require help with everyday living, cleaning, shopping and so on. This is the role of the homemaker services.

"Unfortunately, an interview at home precedes the start of the service and there can be a two- or three-week gap before the homemaker arrives. In order to circumvent the problem, home care rather than homemaker service will be requested for a patient and the homemaker will be provided without delay for a patient that is already receiving home care. This is an obvious and expensive misuse of the home care service in order to free an even more expensive active treatment bed. It would seem far more fruitful to integrate the homemaker service fully with the home care system and place this expanded service under the aegis of the assessment placement agency. The homemaker service would then become one of the home care options for a patient upon discharge from hospital or nursing home and his eligibility to receive such help would no longer be contingent upon his requiring professional health services."

Their recommendation is that the organized home care programme be broadened by allowing homemaker services to be provided as a single option when appropriate. What they're speaking to there is the crazy bureaucracy at the moment which so often makes it impossible for people to get the services which they need when they need them. This is why I asked you about the criteria, because if the home care and the homemaker services are tied in together and depend upon a nursing component, then many people won't get the homemaker because they don't need the home care; and the home care, up until now, has not been available for chronic patients. So you get all kinds of people who don't fit the existing criteria.

The comment that was made in this report—not on the home care service, but on the nursing home service—contains a very illuminating little phrase which I think could be used about homemakers as much as about the nursing homes. They say about the bottlenecks: "The most disruptive bottleneck in the health care delivery system stems from the current ministry definition governing eligibility for nursing home care." They discuss that at some length and then they say: "Surely patient need takes priority over the funding structure. The system should be geared to the patient and not vice versa." I think that is what has happened with the home care system. The needs of the person are geared to the funding structure and the bureaucratic tests they have to go through. We really need a turn-around of that.

In this report there is some very tough criticism of the whole nursing home system at the moment, including the care in the home system and decision-making in the system. The report is fascinating. It purports to be about distribution of hospital and nursing home beds, but it has a lot of interesting and tough things to say about our health care delivery system.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If I may just respond to that, I don't think I would disagree with much of that report either. I think that is why I have indicated to you that the system for the provision of residential services for senior citizens requires a great deal of attention in order to alleviate some of the inequities of funding, placement, assessment—the whole range of services available. That is why I have indicated to you that I think it perhaps needs to have a very careful study, and that is what we are considering at the moment.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I wonder if it has been studied to death already. We have had study after study, and each of them—I think you're doing it again, either consciously or unconsciously—concentrates on the institutional services.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, I think this would go in the other direction of de-institutionalizing and providing alternatives for those who require them.

**Mr. McClellan:** Where are the alternatives? Where are the programmes that make it possible?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** As I pointed out to you—



**Mr. McClellan:** It's not a matter of rhetoric; it's a matter of programmes and resources.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** We have had three pilot projects providing home care for chronic patients. They are very successful. They provide a wide range of services to people in their homes. We indicated to you the other day that we have an employment programme to encourage people to become involved in home maintenance and the kinds of home care programmes that you were pointing out—doing shopping and those things that would enable senior citizens to remain in their own homes. There are many programmes under way at the moment.

[2:45]

I think the whole situation has to be looked at very carefully because there are inequities in the system. We know that. There are inequities in funding. There are inequities in facilities. I think the whole area is one that deserves a great deal of consideration.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, if I may just make an aside on the inequities. I think the inequity for me was really pointed up last week when the announcement was made of the home help programme—the programme in which young people will work with senior citizens. My daughter has got a job this coming summer, working for Natural Resources, I guess. I believe she's going to be taking tickets at the entrance to a provincial park. She will be paid \$4.41 an hour, for which I say thank God, because it's expensive to send her to university. But what do we say about the priorities in this province when we'll pay her \$4.41 an hour to take tickets, and we'll pay only \$20 a day for people to work with senior citizens in their homes—a service, in my mind, so much more valuable? A machine can take tickets. You can drop money in a slot; it can issue them. There are all kinds of ways that you can issue tickets at the entrance to a provincial park. But there's no way to give people support and care and concern and self respect in their home, except through the human component, of people working for other people.

You say a lot to people about how you value their work by what you choose to pay them for their work. I find it offensive that we should pay some \$4.41 an hour for taking tickets and \$20 a day for working with senior citizens. There's something very wrong with our priorities. Both those jobs, in a sense, are make-work jobs for students over the

summer, although you're telling us that the senior citizens project is long term. Therefore, it deserves even more long-term serious respects as a piece of work worth doing and worth paying for. I leave that comment with you.

I wanted to remark on the obsession that we seem to have in Ontario with institutionalizing, although we all give lip service to de-institutionalizing, going the other way. I was most interested in that recent report by Nathan and Roberta Marcus—I'm sure you've read it—produced for Canadian Pensioners Concerned Incorporated and the Association of Jewish Senior Clubs. I was particularly interested because Peterborough was one of the areas they studied. They looked at the waiting lists for nursing homes and senior citizens homes in Thunder Bay and Peterborough, and the major thrust of the report was to try to find ways of reducing the time on the waiting lists, streamlining the process of getting people into the institutional beds.

Fair enough; that's a legitimate project to undertake—to cut down the time, cut out the duplication, get people into beds. But what I find so interesting about that report was that in nearly every case documented, the people didn't need institutional service. The problem for them wasn't the time on the waiting list. It was that they were in a sense being forced into an institutional setting and therefore onto the waiting list, for various reasons.

I looked at the Thunder Bay case. Case number one in Thunder Bay: The fellow said he liked being independent, would like a room with hot and cold running water, and had no desire to enter a senior citizens home. But because he didn't have hot and cold running water, he'd been encouraged to put his name down on the list for the senior citizens home. You know, that's thinking backwards. What that guy needs is hot and cold running water and his independence.

Case number two had to retire unwillingly at 65. The financial burden is what's driving him towards a senior citizens home because of the high cost of rent. He's applied to the senior citizens home only because there's such a long waiting list for Ontario Housing, and a senior citizens home would be cheaper; he considers it the least desirable alternative. The problem for him isn't how long he's on the waiting list for the senior citizens home—it's the fact that he can't afford to live where he is now. Ontario Housing doesn't have enough subsidized units, so he's forced into an institutional setting.

Case number three: The lady lives at the CNIB residence although she is not blind and



her daughter says: "What else could I do?" Well, there has to be something else that could be done.

Case number four: A confused and irresponsible old man who's a burden on his family and making great pressure on the marriage of his son, I guess, and daughter-in-law. One doesn't know the details of the case but one suspects that with good support systems, perhaps a day centre for that old fellow and some weekend support, he could stay at home.

Case number five: Geriatric patient in the hospital. She could manage to live on her own, the doctors say. She's been waiting for over 11 months for accommodation she can afford. Again, the senior citizens home is the only alternative.

I don't want to go through all these cases, but it seems to me that the Doctors Marcus have been blinded again by the institutional ethos. It's legitimate to want to try and cut down duplication pressure on the waiting list, but that isn't the problem for these cases they're documenting. The problem is that the institutions are just irrelevant, really, to their situations.

I was disappointed to see that Thunder Bay had more cases than Peterborough. I felt that that wasn't fair. I should have had a chance to look at more of Peterborough. They did comment that the waiting lists were inaccurate and incomplete. They had some good things to say about the waiting lists, and they decided that the high demand for residential care in Thunder Bay was mainly because of the shortage of adequate housing, the high rents, and the shortage of subsidized accommodation.

This brings us back once again to my first point about the real necessity for a decent income and decent housing being basic to all of us, and particularly for senior citizens. The institution, really, has been an expensive and unnecessary escape hatch. People in Peterborough apparently had problems not so much with the high rents but with maintaining their homes. Again, we're back to keeping going the accommodation that's available. Problems with transportation—and I would have expected that, having seen that 33 per cent without the use of a car figure that our students produced in 1975. Dr. Marcus just reinforces that. And social problems—people lonely, needing human contact and thinking they can find it perhaps in an institution. People needing assistance with housework, gardening, snow shovelling, and human contacts quoted again.

The conclusions included the fact that the Doctors Marcus found inadequate counselling services for the elderly person and his family, insufficient social and recreational outreach programmes, and acute need for nursing care for people who need heavy nursing and special care. So really we've got an oddly ironic situation. The people who desperately need heavy nursing care are unable to find it, and people who don't need to be in institutions are being forced through financial exigencies to go there.

Somehow we have to reach the point of a co-ordination of transportation, housing, social and health services for the elderly. Maybe we have to get at it through a green paper. I guess I just get a little impatient—we all do—with the studies and the—I'd like us just to take hold and start doing it.

I was looking at some figures. I think I'd better stop here.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If I could just make a comment on that "beautifully written profile," as it's been referred to. The profiles are really composite.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I know.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** This makes it a little fictionalized, which is unfortunate.

**Ms. Sandeman:** It's fictionalized, but it's composite and presumably therefore reflects the reality of what they found.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I have a rebuttal from the people who are involved in Thunder Bay which I would like, if you're not aware of it—

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** —in response to this. Have you seen it? "A report prepared by University of Toronto researchers on elderly persons waiting for institutional care in the city has been criticized by city officials as inaccurate. Roberta Marcus was commissioned last spring to interview persons on waiting lists in this city and in Peterborough. The study was ordered by Pensioners Concerned and the Association of Jewish Senior Clubs' Co-ordinated Services to the Jewish Elderly. In the study, Mrs. Marcus said that elderly persons in Thunder Bay wait eight months to a year for normal care in homes for the aged and from one to two years for nursing care.

"Both Don MacLeod, director of social services, and Dan O'Gorman, administrator for homes for the aged, said entrance into the homes for persons requiring normal care

is almost immediate. Persons requiring extended care usually wait four to six months, according to Mr. MacLeod. He said her conclusions implied that most persons on the waiting list were extremely poor, but a survey of persons entering city institutions showed that only 10 per cent had liquid assets of less than \$1,000 and 28 per cent had assets of more than \$10,000. Mr. O'Gorman said the institutions are paid by the clients as means permit and the deficit, whether in normal or extended care, is made up by provincial and municipal governments." Which seems to me to be an indictment of the report.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I read that, and I was interested in that, because in a sense it bears out my thesis. We had the same kind of comment—and I've got the cutting from the Peterborough Examiner—that questions the time on the waiting list. But do you see what has happened? A part of the report that everybody is concerned with is whether or not people have to wait the length of time to get into institutions. Neither the original report, nor the people providing a rebuttal, really gets at alternatives, at the kind of thing that the profile suggests.

There was a report in the Peterborough Examiner, saying, "People on the list often find beds in larger nursing homes before they're offered places in the small homes. Average waiting time to enter the home"—this is our senior citizens home—"is six months. Many of those on the list will have found places elsewhere or may have changed their minds." They take issue with that, but that's the institutional point of view.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That's right.

**Ms. Sandeman:** All the people who were interviewed—and I know them all; Mr. Lovelady, the fellow who runs Fairhaven, and Marg Purtell, who is the discharge officer at the hospital—were institutional people talking about the waiting lists to get into their institutions. They're doing a fine job; there's no doubt about it. But we're obsessed—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** With institutions.

**Ms. Sandeman:** —with institutionalization.

Let me finish by trying some figures on you. We could argue about these, but it has been suggested that an adequate ratio of home helps—that's not home care but your home help personnel—would be a guideline of 12 full-time home helps per 1,000 of the elderly population. If you extrapolate that to Ontario, we would need 8,500 full-time home

helps. I don't think we have that many. I don't think our \$100-a-week programme is going to do that.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't think it was ever intended to provide that.

**Ms. Sandeman:** No.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think that's unfair.

**Ms. Sandeman:** I'm suggesting that if you take a ratio which other communities and jurisdictions are working towards to keep people out of institutions, we're falling very far behind. For instance, look how far behind we are in housing. It has been suggested by CMHC that a proportion of 15 per cent of all housing for senior citizens should be co-operative, non-profit or geared-to-income housing. We have less than five per cent of that kind of housing for our senior citizens. We're way behind in housing. We're way behind in providing home help.

There was a suggestion about the number of meals on wheels you might need. Given the fact that so many people in Peterborough, and I suspect in other centres, are not getting proper nutrition, it has been suggested that an adequate guideline for meals on wheels is 200 meals per week per 1,000 elderly. My arithmetic has never been my strong point, but I figure if that's true, then in Ontario we should be serving about 142,000 meals a week. I don't think we are. One could go on. We don't begin to meet any of the basic guidelines that other jurisdictions are working towards as a minimum.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** May I ask what other jurisdictions?

[3:00]

**Ms. Sandeman:** I'm taking these figures from The Priorities for Health and Personal Social Services in England: A Consultative Document, published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office at £1.60 net. It's a 1976 consultative document, the kind of thing you are talking about. Let's set our priorities. Let's set up guidelines. Barbara Castle's guidelines are for a ratio of 12 per thousand home helps and 200 per week per thousand elderly meals on wheels. For home nursing the guideline is for one per 2,500 to 4,000 elderly persons according to local needs of home nursing. For day-centre places the guideline is three to four places per thousand. I don't think we are into the day-care concept for elderly people except in a very minimal way.



**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** We do have some outreach programmes and centres for the aged.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, we have outreach programmes that you can count on the fingers of one hand. In chiropody services, we are woefully lacking in foot care for elderly people. The last figure I saw from Britain suggested that 14.9 per cent of the senior citizens are receiving regular chiropody care and they still feel that they are not doing enough. In 1974 they had in Britain 1,400 whole time equivalent chiropodists. Their population is larger, but if you break that down it's about one per 5,000 elderly. We are very low on all of those. I could go on. They've got criteria for residential placements.

It is not always fair to compare one country with another because our economic, social and geographic needs and so on are different. But it's very interesting that their minimums are so far above anything that we have now. I think we've been very slow in looking at co-ordination of care for the elderly. I just hope that year after year when the advisory council comes and talks to you about housing, income maintenance and transportation that we don't get replies that say we didn't get the income maintenance response in time to take it into account—I know that wasn't your fault—and then ignore it.

When we talk about housing, I hope we are not fobbed off with saying they could work through the OHRP programme and when we talk about home care, we are not fobbed off by being told there's a \$100-a-week make-work programme for unemployed young people. The care for any of our citizens is too important to be dealt with on an ad hoc piecemeal basis like that, particularly for senior citizens who have given so much to the community and somehow feel now that they are being sloughed off in return.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think in all fairness you are talking of a small percentage of the senior citizens of this province who would fall into that category of needing so many of the programmes that you are talking about. By and large, the senior citizens in this province either are recipients of the many programmes that are available to senior citizens—

**Mr. McClellan:** Institutional programmes.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Not necessarily, not all of the senior citizens of this province are in institutions by any stretch of the imagination. The larger percentage of them are very independent and doing very well. But there is that

minority number who do need the very things you are speaking to. I don't deny that at all.

**Mr. Grande:** That they are doing well? Where do you get that information?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** One only has to visit as many senior citizens as I do and one only has to receive the delegations that come in from the United Senior Citizens of Ontario and the Pensioners Concerned. I receive the delegations twice a year. I speak with them and I take their recommendations. I would say over the past two or three years the recommendations they have been putting forward are in the areas of—I can think of one area where they would like to have free prescription glasses and hearing aids. But when it comes to the other areas, there is very little they are saying about the needs of senior citizens in the way of many of the programmes you have been suggesting.

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Sandeman, are you through?

**Ms. Sandeman:** Yes, temporarily. I guess I've had an hour. We seem to be splitting it up an hour at a time.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Conway, did you wish to comment or ask some questions?

**Mr. Conway:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I shall try to confine my remarks to two or three topics and perhaps we can revert because I know other members are anxious to offer some comments and judgements.

Did I understand earlier from the Chair that we have decided to take the vote in its entirety and not to distinguish items? Then that really makes me want to ask in very general terms some basic questions and to elicit, if possible, from the minister particularly some comments on what I would determine to be two or three major questions in today's Ontario community on the matter of social policy. I think there are two or three things that are reasonably current and two or three things about which at least some members of the government have made some rather interesting pronouncement.

I can't resist the temptation, although many others may have mentioned this in earlier deliberations—and I apologize for my dereliction in not having been present—but I was just noticing in the representative list of policy items reviewed by the secretariat staff, page 2-1, that couched in the second column is an oblique reference to the OECA network expansion. Having regard to some of the earlier things we were encountering this week I just wondered whether or not you would care to

offer from the point of view of OECA any comments on what we have discussed and what we have learned as to what some of the inner workings of that body have been, and whether you as a minister had any concern about the kinds of things that emanated from within that particular, if peripherally, related body to which this particular page makes some reference. What did you think of the internal report of OECA this week? Did you have any comments you wanted to make?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** My own personal comment would be that there was a serious lack of judgement.

**Mr. Conway:** Right. Well, that's kind of unfair. I just thought I would perhaps be picayune. There are two or three items that have been quite front and centre and I want to get some judgement from you, not as to what you as a minister think we might do or what you as a minister might think the government might do, but what you as a minister and as a member of a government think we can as a society and as a government do about items that are often referred to in here, areas particularly relating to pornography and racism. I wanted to get at the outset, because I wanted to keep my initial comments very general, what you think in the area of social policy a government—any government, but this government is a good place to start—can do about the growing tendency, at least the growing concern, in the area of pornography as an apparent evil in our society. What do you think you can do about it?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** For one thing I think it would be very difficult to stop it from coming on to our bookshelves and into the bookstores. Everyone's assessment of pornography certainly is not the same. What I might consider very distasteful you might condone. I didn't mean that to come out exactly the way it sounded.

**Mr. Maecck:** Probably true though.

**Mr. Conway:** I shall let the archbishop decide.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I would hate to be put in the position as a government of having to censor and make decisions on what I felt was pornography and what I thought should be done about it, but I certainly have a very strong feeling about its accessibility. I have a very strong feeling that it should not be permitted where young children might have access to it. I guess that gets down to the distribution of those kinds of questionable

materials that are abroad throughout the province.

**Mr. Conway:** All right. To carry that just a few steps further, you have landed, I think justifiably, at the area of distribution. We found a month ago the federal Minister of Revenue stopping distribution of certain materials in this area. What do you think the government of Ontario can do or should do in that regard? You have identified the area as distribution. Do you think it's the function or the role of government, as you see it, to get involved and how do you control that kind of distribution effectively?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** The entrance of it into Canada is a federal responsibility and so that determination would have to be made at that level of government as to what they thought appropriate to enter the country and what they didn't. I never happen to have seen a copy of that particular magazine that was stopped, so I couldn't really comment on whether or not I would consider that pornographic.

**Mr. Conway:** But to the extent that any of this circulates internally, have you regard to the fact that it may actually have entered the country? Let's just suppose that it is circulating internally; what do you suggest that we might do, if the government pursues the line very avidly articulated by the Attorney General? What can you do?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think it would be very difficult to introduce any legislation that had to deal with it because of the whole difficulty of censorship, where it begins and where it ends. I think you have to leave it up to local people to make the decision about the accessibility of all kinds of literature that might be classified as pornographic and as to where that should be displayed.

**Mr. Conway:** So then you are essentially saying that in this area about which there has been considerable provincial government pronouncement there is nothing really that we can do as a government.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think that individuals have to start taking exception and making their wishes known, if they do business in stores where it is displayed. If they would like to have it removed, I think it's up to individuals and communities to make those wishes known to the proprietors of stores that they don't approve of it. I think that that's where the pressure should be. I just don't see that we could introduce legislation and I don't think we could enforce it.



**Mr. Conway:** All that you have basically said and concluded is that in this area—and I am not disagreeing with what you are saying, I just want to clarify it in my own mind—there really is nothing the Ontario government can, in your estimation at least, effectively legislate.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Those are my own comments. I don't know if legally there is anything else that the Ontario government could do. I just think it would be very difficult to enforce something that has to do with censorship of what one person believes to be pornographic and someone else might not. I just feel that it should not be so readily accessible to young people.

**Mr. Conway:** In a related area—and I notice there's considerable reference to it in the areas of multiculturalism that have come forward, certainly in an ongoing debate and particularly in Metro over the past year or two—is the whole question of racism in our society and how that bears upon social development in government. What do you think government might do there?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't know about government per se again, because you can't impose legislation and make people like one another and make people stop making rude remarks and making life difficult for those they don't agree with. I think if more communities across this province were doing some of the things we are doing in Scarborough, perhaps that might be helpful.

We have a programme in Scarborough whereby new immigrant children who come into our school system are encouraged to share with fellow students their culture, right to the point of having the families come in, cook a meal of their own culture in the school, talk about the history of their country, get to know everything they can learn about the other person's background and have those people take pride in sharing the culture of their own country with children from other cultures.

I think racism, really, when you get right down to it, is based on ignorance. It's based on ignorance about how other people feel, think and live. Unless we can get to young children and get them to understand what it's all about and how to live with and understand and respect other people, then we can never hope to overcome it. I think it has to start within the school system.

**Mr. Conway:** Aid to the Third World is a topic of some priority in this building at least, as indicated by the Premier (Mr.

Davis). I realize again it doesn't have a direct bearing on domestic social development policy, although I think many of the councils and the related agencies of this secretariat have a very deep concern and an ongoing interest in and about aid to the Third World.

[3:15]

If you were being hypothetical or perhaps otherwise advising the decision-making authority, wherever that might reside in this province, what would your advice be on the recommendations that are presently before your government?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Obviously it's under consideration at the moment, so I'm not about to make any comment.

**Mr. Conway:** Is there no judgement? It has been under consideration I suppose since at least the Hilliard report was offered.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, there's been a recent meeting at which I attended with the Premier and Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). At that time, a commitment was given that we would look at some of the new proposals they had brought forward and that there would be a follow-up meeting within the month.

**Mr. Conway:** In general policy terms, does a province have a role in the federal community? Does a province, in your estimation, have any role in that international area?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Again, with respect, I think for a policy that is under discussion at cabinet it is not appropriate for me to say how I feel at this moment.

**Mr. Conway:** All right, I'll presume that we'll know in the fullness of the first week of the election campaign.

Not too very long ago our good friend the member for Eglinton (Mr. McMurtry), in a much-publicized speech in my part of Ontario, in the Belleville area, offered some interesting comments about another general area.

**Mr. Chairman:** Would all the way down to Belleville be part of the member's area?

**Hon. Mr. Birch:** I think it is.

**Mr. Conway:** Eastern Ontario, while ignored by the government, still exists in its own right.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That's a little unfortunate because it certainly isn't ignored.

**Mr. Conway:** The minister made a statement in the Belleville area as to what he thought might be a new relationship between young people particularly and marijuana. When he returned to Toronto I think he amended that. In general terms, the position he took in Trenton or Belleville was a basically soft position, that we should be relaxing our attitude to the whole business about marijuana particularly. There seemed to be a great deal of consternation among certain elements of the government when he returned to Toronto that night.

I wondered in the area of social development and policy relating thereto, how you and your ministry felt about something which I think is pretty relevant to people of my generation? Do you share in any way, shape or form the views of the Attorney General which were essentially that we should be relaxing our traditional approaches and views?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** To be perfectly frank, I think we're straying far away from the estimates. As to policy, that is a federal responsibility, as you are well aware. We can make all kinds of comments about what we feel, but when it gets right down to it it's the federal government's responsibility to make those determinations.

**Mr. Conway:** It seems to me there's a considerable reference in some of this to drug abuse, and I presume that that might have some relationship. I appreciate what you're saying. Some of these questions, I hope, bear some relationship. What you're saying, if nothing else, is that our much-publicized Attorney General in terms of his own jurisdiction is largely irrelevant, because he's making and being widely reported on statements that deal with materials over which he has absolutely no control. I think we'd want to put that on the record.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If we went back—and I think this should also be indicated on the record—he was speaking to a group of young people. My understanding is some of his comments were taken out of context in the follow-up newspaper stories.

**Mr. Conway:** Am I to conclude from what you say that you really think the whole business of marijuana does not have any bearing on the social development policy for the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I didn't suggest that.

**Mr. Chairman:** In relation to this, Mr. Conway, if I can intervene as chairman, the

area we are dealing with is estimates, not necessarily the philosophy of the policies of the minister.

**Mr. Conway:** I just wanted to ask—

**Mr. Chairman:** Excuse me, if the minister wishes to editorialize some of her personal comments I have no objections. But I think in fairness we're dealing with the estimates.

**Mr. Conway:** Just on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I well appreciate that. I look at the vote, particularly item No. 1, which says "social development policy." I always assumed this secretariat was to determine in general and overview terms the reaction of the community as expressed to the government on such general questions as drug use in our society. I just wondered if the ministry or the secretariat had a point of view on the whole question?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Conway, as far as I'm concerned if the minister has a point of view she is more than able to respond. I'm just saying that we're dealing with the estimates. Does the minister want to give a point of view?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I'm quite prepared to give my own point of view, but I'm not prepared to comment on the Attorney General's point of view, which was his own personal point of view.

**Mr. Conway:** All right, your own personal point of view.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I would be adamantly against legalizing marijuana. It's as simple as that.

**Mr. Conway:** Would you care to embellish that or amplify that as to reasons?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Just as simply as that. I see no reason to legalize marijuana.

**Mr. Conway:** I'm not saying necessarily legalizing it, I'm suggesting that perhaps taking away some of the really stiff penalties that may not be relevant in this day and age.

**Mr. Chairman:** Have you any observations you wish to share with us as to how you feel about it?

**Mr. Conway:** I think it is the prerogative of government to explain the position that only they, as the executive council, can offer, as the Premier tells us. I am not here to philosophize, I am here to ask some questions.



**Mr. Chairman:** The government's position is that they are not in favour of marijuana right now, are they?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That's right, absolutely, that is our position.

**Mr. McClellan:** You're supposed to be neutral.

**Mr. Conway:** You've taken, I think, a very justifiable position. I'm just interested in hearing some of your own personal justification. You believe we should basically stick to a pretty hard-line position on the whole marijuana question, and that in fact any effort to decriminalize it would be met by you personally with a strong reaction in the negative.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** As I pointed out to you before, it is a federal decision.

**Mr. Conway:** But you indicated just earlier that—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** My own personal view. I didn't say that it represented the view of the policy field, the secretariat or anyone else. It's my own personal view, from being involved for many years in the drug problems back when I was a member of the board of health in Scarborough and seeing some of the victims of both soft drugs and hard drugs. There's just no way that I would feel comfortable in being party to legalizing it.

**Mr. Conway:** The question then, of perhaps more immediate and direct relevance, because I would be the last person to stray from the topics at hand, is the question of youth and alcohol, alcohol advertising and the like. I think, specifically, of sections 4-9 and 4-10. I wonder if you have anything of an update to offer to us at this time on the whole matter of where the government stands on that very interesting question of youth and alcohol?

**Mr. McClellan:** You are obsessed with drugs today.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I'm having difficulty finding the section.

**Mr. Conway:** I'm looking at section 4-10—Subject: Youth and Alcohol. I'm just going to keep it general. "The recommendations contained in the youth secretariat report on youth and alcohol required a co-ordinated response from a number of government ministries." Well understood. I wonder where we stand with that co-ordinated response? Perhaps the member for Mississauga North

(Mr. Jones) might comment on where we stand right now with that proposal and with any legislation that might be forthcoming.

**Mr. Jones:** I am happy to comment. There were 32 recommendations in that report, as you well know. Some seemed to have the most focus of attention, some of them almost, unfortunately, to the exclusion of some of the others that we felt very strongly about. The report, as you may know, came to the cabinet as a whole and my minister, of course, co-ordinated an ad hoc special committee of cabinet. A lot of those recommendations—you mentioned one specifically; the advertising side of it is presently, as you may know, in front of the select committee on highway safety, which I understand, and I am a member of that committee, is about to bring down its first paper for tabling in the House. I think they expect that within a week or so. Some of your colleagues had a lot to say about that. I know your former leader has had some comments about the advertising, so I think it's being well discussed in a lot of appropriate areas, as well as the justice field, social development field, and the others that apply.

So I would think we are on the doorstep, as far as some of the major recommendations are concerned, of seeing comment not just by government people who have been studying it but also by the House as a whole. The select committee has touched on no less than about seven of the major recommendations including age, including lifestyle advertising, the driving, the whole issue of penalties, spinning out of the driver safety side of the alcohol problem.

**Mr. Conway:** You say we are on the doorstep of some government responses. Does that mean that we can expect, let's say, a position on the drinking age, which is, I think, probably the most high-profile of the decisions that will ultimately have to be made on that whole report?

**Mr. Jones:** It may be the most high-profile of them but we never did pretend that it was the number one issue. What I'm saying is not necessarily at this stage the government view, because here the select committee is taking a rather realistic and non-partisan look at it and it has the latest information. The youth and alcohol report did open some important doors, to my way of thinking, for communities to be discussing it, young people to be discussing it.

I can tell you now as the youth secretariat continues its visitations to high schools for one, where it is a big topic, as you know,

as well as a big problem, they are lifting the blinds on the subject. They are making a lot of comments to us. Yes, it's true, they sometimes talk about marijuana and some of the other side issues to it, but they recognize that as the other drugs have abated somewhat, alcohol has been the one that has filled that gap. They have had a part in some of those recommendations, as you well know, and there has been a specific government response to some of them.

You will note that young people said at the very outset that we should have tougher control over the availability. That's where age popped into the subject. One of the ones they felt very strongly about, those of the under-18 group as it stands at present, the illegal drinkers who have now moved in in advance of the legal age, they need some kind of a picture identification, as you may remember. You will notice that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) responded by making the age of majority card the only acceptable identification at the liquor outlets. That has resulted in quite an increase. About 20,000 of those cards were out the last time we heard from the ministry, whereas they had been available for two or three years before that and they only had 3,000 out.

That was a response by the government to something young people thought was really important and that had to happen. You'll note that the select committee is carrying forward further our other recommendation that ideally, rather than select just an age group, a picture on the driver's licence was something we wanted the government to look at. You've probably heard comments by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and you'll notice in the select committee that there is a recommendation coming forward. I think that was pretty well open to the press. Your colleagues would know, they voted on it.

**Mr. Conway:** As for the select committee, this is what I would expect. As you say, I think it has been very positive in its deliberations, and extremely divided along the lines that only the personalities, I suppose, would explain it. It was my determination—

**Mr. Jones:** No. I don't think so.

**Mr. Conway:** Well, it seems to me that, at least from the cosmetic point of view, the drinking age certainly may not be the number one priority, I'm not saying that, but it seems to me it is probably the most talked about, in my experience in an obviously non-

drinking part of Ontario has any bearing on the topic.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Why is that so? In Ottawa?

**Mr. Conway:** The Ottawa Valley is known for its historical temperance—by the Irish in particular. I wanted to know from the parliamentary assistant what his view is of the dilemma of the drinking age thing in particular? I have got a whole series of related problems, I think, of the hearings that were held in Pembroke, where the thing was discussed in a related way. As someone who's probably been far more closely associated with it in the last two years than any of us, what do you see as the real dichotomy, the real dilemma or problem that has to be settled?

**Mr. Jones:** I think we found rather early on that the youth and alcohol question was probably the most sensitive and the one the government should be addressing itself to the soonest. Nevertheless, it was all just a part of the overall increase in drinking by all age groups.

[3:30]

We found early on not only from the ARF and the other jurisdictions—and I might say the select committee that has done even more recent work on it—that it's an increasing social problem for all age groups. It's probably the most sensitive in the younger age groups and that's why we're addressing ourselves to some of those groupings. Some of the probationary licence proposals and other things that are before the select committee and about to come forward are a direct result of that.

We did find some of the things that we're seeing being done positively by the government have increased. Take our advertisements on the media, on TV, by the Ministry of Health. We're getting a very positive comment from young people. As I say, we're continuing our dialogues as part of our mandate as a youth secretariat on current issues of the day. You can understand about alcohol. Young people tend to be a little sophisticated about it. They get into some of the other root causes, such as youth unemployment, which the youth secretariat, as you know, is working full blast on.

As we talk to young people, we find they're actually applauding the government for telling of the other side of the story to help offset some of the heavy lifestyle, media advertising which they see as a very real cause



and effect, especially to the younger age groups.

**Mr. Conway:** What kind of a dialogue are you initiating within the government to resolve or at least to talk out the obvious conflict of interest that's involved? Clearly, on the one hand we recognize the social problem; on the other hand, we've got the situation where considerable moneys are derived therefrom. I think of some smaller communities in my part of Ontario where the most spectacular and the most recent new government building is a beautiful new liquor store. I'm just wondering has there been a discussion entered into by people like yourself with some of the people who depend on the revenue?

**Mr. Jones:** I've heard this comment before, that there's some great perceived wealth, and certainly there are dollars that flow into the provincial coffers. We're all aware of them. I don't think there's anybody on any side of the House that wouldn't get up and agree 100 per cent that he'd be happy to forego the money that might come from young drinkers, for example. I'll go for that very happily. As we found set out in our report, the dollar costs to the ministries just in the social development field were horrendous.

We found 10 per cent of the hospital costs traced back to it. I shouldn't say we did. The Addiction Research Foundation has articulated that several times, and they've updated it. Some of the other social costs all amounted to an awful lot of money, which is greater than what we've been taking in. We'd be happy to see the reverse. That's why the thrust is in that direction.

I think you were saying something about the different ministries, I guess that was what you were alluding to.

**Mr. Conway:** There's a public perception of government, whether we like it or not, as having an obvious conflict of interest in this regard, and I agree with you that many governments would happily forego their involvement with the liquor trade because of the social costs.

**Mr. Jones:** This one too.

**Mr. Conway:** I would perhaps retort to that that the costs involved are more long-term, more deep-seated and more difficult to quantify. The benefits are perhaps less, but obviously so. In other words, the dollars that flow in are needed, they're there and we depend on them in the very short term. That probably doesn't necessarily need to count

for a great deal. But I was thinking particularly of someone the other day who was talking about the budget and saying that by dependence on the revenues gained from cigarettes, for example, we make it more difficult for us to make a social decision in another direction. Whether or not he was correct, I don't know, but he was making that position from a relatively informed lobby. I forget which one it was—the non-smokers perhaps. I think of that in a related way with the liquor business.

**Mr. Jones:** As you said, I've been very close to it, and I have. I've followed the recommendations as they went to cabinet and I was happy to see that my minister was co-ordinating those with the other ministries that are involved. We did in a report, as you remember, set out where we thought each of those recommendations should go, either to one or a composite of ministries. We've been delighted to see how they've made it a priority, and I can tell you they have.

I'm also happy to see—and I said it from the outset—that the age thing, for example, was an all-party decision. As it is being talked to now, I'm happy to see it's stayed out of the political football arena. People really have talked to it, as I've seen members from all parties do in this most recent occurrence of the select committee. But the government, be it any of the key ministries that are involved or those that had side effects to it, certainly hasn't thought in any terms about anything other than the big social cost as number one. I don't think the revenue that's taken from it, has ever been any factor in anybody's thoughts as I've looked at it. I know, unfortunately, that's perceived to be so by some people.

**Mr. Conway:** The question really was has there been any discussion with the other side in this whole debate?

**Mr. Jones:** What side are you talking about? The ministry that might take the money in.

**Mr. Conway:** No, the Liquor Commission, as to their thoughts on the whole problem.

**Mr. Jones:** The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has been very close to all the discussions that have taken place with the federal government, and some have about the advertising situation. Our minister, Mrs. Birch, has visited the other ministers from across the country, and Mr. Lalonde. All of the dialogue that has flowed from that report has had a sense of urgency about it. It's

moving carefully because we're all aware that some of these things could cause a reaction by young people. You're talking about their nature. A disrespect and kind of backlash to what we're out to achieve would be a wrong way of going about it, so we're going carefully in some things and yet with urgency on others.

**Mr. Conway:** Coming back just to reiterate what you said earlier, we are approaching the doorstep of decision.

**Mr. Jones:** I'm only talking about several of the key issues coming out of the select committee but they also happen to be key recommendations that were in our report. And we in the youth secretariat did pass our updated comments along to that select committee.

**Mr. Conway:** Finally, I have some questions on Experience 77 which may turn out to be an experience for us all.

**Mr. Jones:** Why do you say that?

**Mr. Conway:** I want to commend the ministry, because of experiences we've had in our area, for the collating of that booklet which is very useful from my own riding office point of view. I don't believe the federal government does it. They're quite inadequate in many areas and that's probably one of them.

**Mr. Jones:** They're learning from us in some of their reports.

**Mr. Conway:** Well, to be sure. There's nothing worse than the deficiencies of governments that are dominated by the same party for generations, quite independent of what stripe or colour.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Speaking federally.

**Mr. Conway:** Speaking governmentally. But I must say that I think that's very worthwhile. It's very useful and it certainly speaks well for some of the planning that goes on.

What reaction have you had from the private sector? I notice a lot of discussion about it in the last few days. Apparently there's a misunderstanding or a little bit of confusion about the Ontario youth employment programme since last Tuesday when it was clearly stated. What has been the response of the private sector to the offer that has been made?

**Mr. Jones:** It's excellent. At this point they're still asking for details of it, as you

may guess. They are working through two processes. They're going to Manpower offices which are informed on the procedure. They're also coming directly to us. Yesterday, for example, I spoke with the president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. They asked if we would supply to their offices copies of these applications in numbers sufficient so that their constituents could have them at hand. This apparently followed a discussion with their directorship where they think the programme is excellent to meet the need.

The number one need is youth unemployment. We've done admittedly a lot. As part of the budget, there was yet another increase in the Experience programme, bringing that from last year's \$12 million to a total now of \$15 million in that area. But we have to watch it very carefully. There's a line, as I'm sure you appreciate, where if it gets into the area of make-work per se, then young people naturally realize we're moving very much away from the Experience thing. This is why we had to move to the private sector because there was very much a need for young people to be harnessed into that. Young people have been telling us, as we go through the province on our career development programme, that they've had some of their expectations out of whack. Now they realize they're in a very tight market, especially students now coming on top of the normal unemployed. We hope this type of programme would help reduce the barriers to the private sector. We've had the argument, on the other hand, lower the minimum wage—and that's an answer—and then we'll hire many. This is the private sector talking to us from different quarters.

In this way, we satisfy the needs of the young people and they gain experience, that most important of all components, as you said was in this pamphlet, but it would be in the private sector mainly, where 85 per cent of them are going to work in the final analysis anyway.

The nature of the questions that we're getting from employers are such that, hopefully, this programme seems to be going in the direction that probably 75 per cent of employees are looking for people to become permanent employees. This is a help, to give them experience so that they can rationalize taking an experienced person with someone who didn't have the experience, which may have been a hangup for them as to why they didn't hire young people before.



We got a typical call yesterday from a woman who has just a one-person operation, her own little business. She's had extra work that she could take someone on, but she was unable to do it because the economics just didn't quite fit yet, until someone had experience. If she could have got a young experienced person to join with her she would have done it. This dollar bonus has caused her to make the decision she had been putting off and take on a young person and she will train her. Out of that, an ongoing job would probably evolve, because the normal process is working now. They're not going to endorse the young people in the normal way, but employers are putting cards in their windows and they're going to Manpower offices to get the applications in order to qualify to be eligible to hire people under this programme.

We were having an excellent response; and if that's any help, those are the types of calls we're getting, not only from people such as the Chamber of Commerce, who incidentally sent us a letter with an endorsement to it. Different chambers have had different opinions about it, as you get to a normal local board, but it's interesting to see the provincial ones.

**Mr. Conway:** You mentioned, of course, the reference to the permanent versus the temporary aspect of this kind of employment; its obvious to anyone who cares to look.

**Mr. Jones:** I'm not pretending to know that we know the answer.

**Mr. Conway:** We have a crisis, of what term is not yet obvious, in youth employment of the permanent kind. From the secretariat's point of view, what is your evolving response to what is going to be, I think, a situation of really grave seriousness before it is improved significantly.

It is my impression, in my own riding, and I have a lot of the Algonquin Park situations, there is a lot of seasonal employment being offered by major people of both governments, federal and provincial. This is going to be as bad a summer as I can recall, and only because it's been as bad a time for young people to get jobs. I'm wondering, is this the response of the secretariat for this summer to the temporary job situation?

**Mr. Jones:** No, that's not the government's whole response.

**Mr. Conway:** What's your response in policy to the problems of a permanent

nature, that is permanent employment for young people who are unemployed at staggeringly unacceptable rates today?

**Mr. Jones:** One of the things is that these programmes, or a lot of them—and that was in the initial period of them—a lot of people thought they were only for students. For example, a lot of people tend to think that Experience programmes are just for students when in fact they're not.

But we also know, from some of our studies in the whole subject of youth unemployment, that exactly what you say is true. We're into a serious situation with it; and we can go back and chronicle that for you, the fact is it exists. We know that 50 per cent of all the summer jobs are taken up by the young unemployed; and if the young unemployed, whether it be in that summer period of the year or whatever period of the year, can get that magic component that they're missing, mainly experience, then they do become more worthwhile and productive for an employer, and then they are sought out as employees. We found that employees, in a study we did last summer, under the Experience programme incidentally, if the employer hired young people, whether of civic or whatever motivation, in the fall they're more inclined to hire a young person, to replace that student, for example, going to work. They have had the productivity proven by having the enthusiasm and vitality of young people working. Before that they were a little bit reluctant, always going with the experience if given the choice.

[3:45]

The types of employers we've heard from since OYEP has been announced, someone that will take on a contract, maybe, that they wouldn't otherwise have, it may mean shipping out of the country, which is a good thing with the balance of payments and all the rest of it, it's probably the magic combination. But even if they're doing summer employment to lighten the load of taking students out of competition with the normal young unemployed. I make that distinction: We are helping the young unemployed. And anything we can give them by way of experience, whether it be working for the summer, when there are so many in your area and other areas, where the students are young, jobs do open up in the summer. We have a \$2.8 billion tourist industry, as you know, and we've got all these other activities that lend themselves to the summer months; it is a good time for students to be

working in certain types of jobs and freeing them up in the all-around.

**Mr. Conway:** What kind of career guidance are you providing, though, particularly to the people who might be coming out just in unprecedented droves from our post-secondary institutions with no hope of permanent employment along the lines for which they might be especially trained? There is really a problem there of grave seriousness for government, certainly not only provincial governments.

**Mr. Jones:** I agree with you; and we are working on it in the youth secretariat. As a matter of fact, this last six months, probably last eight months, one of the things we have been working on the very most—and it ties, I suppose in a way, back to the alcohol report. Because we said at the very start of the alcohol report—everybody looked and said, “Oh, increase the age,” as you say it was very newsy—but we said we would address ourselves to some of the base causes. Some of them were the job-hop situations, unique to young people, or higher in young people; and some of the admittedly enhanced expectations that young people have about jobs. And that’s society as a whole that has worked on them, and they are having to reassess them at this stage.

We have been involved in a process where service clubs and the career guidance people across the province, are joining in individual communities; because that is where it has to happen, it can’t happen from Queen’s Park or from Toronto or any other big city. We’ve had them in Ottawa, Kingston and Sault Ste. Marie, in Thunder Bay and London and Waterloo, and they are working very well.

We bring businessmen together—employers, professional people, unions—and they are sitting down with the career guidance people, in teachers’ associations and federations, and they are bringing the students in with them, and the businessmen are analysing what job opportunities in that community are likely to be at the end of that educational tunnel, when the student is going to make the transition from school to work. Whereas in many cases the business people have admitted heretofore they built a big \$2 million capital expenditure plant, and the last thing they think about is the work force in the area, now they are trying, with this combination of business people, professional people, the people who will be providing the jobs, going into the school system, identifying and helping to give some indications to the young people in the

system what’s likely to be the case when they come out on that market.

Now no one is telling them don’t come out into that market as a nurse or whatever, but at least they will know what they are coming into and they can perhaps better make a directional change into another career area that won’t be glutted, because we know from our studies that there are certain areas where there is a crying need for employment for young people coming out and we have other areas where there is a glut, just an absolute glut. A lot of it has been lack of information in what we call career development; which is, I guess, an extra component that we would like to see in the existing career guidance. Career guidance people are doing some fancy things with computers, as you well know, to help in that information process, but we think this is the best thing we’ve seen work. It takes different forms in different communities, depending on what the work force is for those young people.

**Mr. Conway:** I can accept all of that, but I just hope that what you are saying is that there is a positive ongoing dialogue taking place. But it just seems to me that the problems are really—

**Mr. Jones:** They are horrendous.

**Mr. Conway:** I just wonder what kind of guidance are you giving to the intake of the system. I don’t get the impression that there is a great deal of slowdown, particularly in terms of post-secondary education systems, both in terms of numbers or emphasis; we are still processing people at a very accelerated rate with the expectations of the mid-1960s for job employment and all the rest of it. They obviously don’t exist, particularly in areas like education—that is employment in education areas—and they are certainly not going to in the next 10 years at least.

I don’t think maybe there is much more we can do today, at least that I want to do, than to emphasize, from my point of view, what I think is a real crisis developing. Society as a whole, I think, is going to be in a very indefensible position if we continue to produce, or if we produce a generation of people who are led to believe, as you say for good or for bad, that the community is going to provide a level of employment for which they are especially trained but then when they are on the job market they realize that that is not there and is not likely to develop. I think we are going to need more than simply a dialogue. I would have hoped we would have had, quite frankly, in the



short term a considerably larger allocation of dollars to this particular summer. What is it?

**Mr. Jones:** We have \$68 million in that area. Take the Experience programme alone. We made about a 22 per cent increase last year, that is, 1976 over 1975. That was at a time of constraint when we were all familiar with the 5.5 per cent growth in budgets in various ministries and zero in others such as MTC and so on. I think the government proves rather clearly that it was dedicated to that because it was aware of last year's situation. As you will see in the capsule in the budget, we also made some rather major increases and some other ones. Not to be forgotten is the OCAP programme, for example, where we had a rather large increase in the budget. We are happy to see it is something like an increase of from \$3.5 million to \$6 million. That has been very successful. The policy design was assisted by the youth secretariat and now is being handled by Colleges and Universities, as you may know. We are running about a 78 per cent success factor in young people going out into work from that programme.

**Mr. Conway:** That's fine. I am not disputing that. I am just saying in general terms the proportion of government commitment may be greater this year than last but so too to an inflated extent is the proportion of young people unemployed. That's the only point I want to make. I am not saying that this year's allocation is not more than last year's. I am saying that this year, with all government programmes taken into consideration, I suspect figures will prove by the summer's end that we will have a majority of young people in Ontario without temporary, if that be the need, or permanent employment. I just wanted to say that.

**Mr. Jones:** May I just say one final thing? You are talking about dollars. We really believe all the answer doesn't lie in the dollars. That's why we have this career development. It may not have a lot of sensational appeal in that it isn't a mammoth, province-wide, one programme because it works best at a local level by the community where we actually find community leaders taking leadership and giving time. It's free time and it only involves a small amount of seed money to rent the place for them to bring themselves together. As we go back to these conferences in their second and third meeting stages, working with vocational schools and working with the post-secondary system area, we find they are really having some notice-

able effects, but you can't force that from any direction.

We are sharing information from a successful one to another community where there are parallels in that new community to which we go. And they are really starting to work. We are getting rid of the mismatch of jobs and we are getting recognition of the fact that we have got a big youth unemployed. We are not alone in this. We are not an island as you well know. We know the situation in the States. We know for that matter that all the western world is having the same problems. We really feel that that is one of the major problems, and it is not a big dollar thing. We don't solve it with big dollars.

We are seeing young people themselves having a new sense of reality about their expectations and turning to the leaders in their community, in the educational system or to the people who eventually very likely will be their employers. Together they are looking at ways in which they can understand best where they should be going. In one case their productivity won't be lost. The community as a whole will benefit from that. In another case young people will know better what they are likely to expect when they come out of that tunnel.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Could I just add a comment to the parliamentary assistant's? I don't think we should lose sight either in this day of very high unemployment and all of our concerns about jobs for young people that in fact we are still going to bring into this province 7,500 offshore workers to work on the farms and the canning factories to do those other jobs our own young people are just not prepared to do. I don't think we should lose sight of that.

**Mr. Villeneuve:** A lot of farmers are looking for help in my area.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Farmers are looking for help and greenhouse operators are looking for help. In many areas of this province it is just impossible to get people who are prepared to do that kind of work which is so necessary to provide the taxes and to provide all of the other things that everybody wants.

**Mr. Conway:** All you are saying is that our education system has perhaps failed in the past 10 years, or at least in the last five years, to emphasize with my generation the reality of that kind of economic consideration.

I have a final question for the provincial secretary on the reorganization of children's

services. I presume you are proceeding with that at this moment?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. Conway: Do you have legislation enabling you to proceed with that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, we have enabling legislation ready to go.

Mr. Conway: You are working toward a July 1 commitment.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The July 1 commitment is one at which time the minister responsible, the Minister of Community and Social Services, will have a timetable for the subsequent developments in this whole area.

Mr. Conway: As for the enabling legislation, you have got it. Are we going to see it soon?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I hope so, very shortly.

Mr. McClellan: In the summer session.

Mr. Conway: I just wondered, because I got the impression it was something of a priority, if in the order of things it was coming down the pipe fairly soon.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As you appreciate, under the new rules of the House there is very little time for introducing legislation. The time is taken up with many other things now. I think there is about a day and a half left now when we can actually bring in legislation, so we are really tied.

Mr. Conway: A day and a half left?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, a day and a half each week to deal with legislation. I don't want you to misread something.

Mr. Conway: I would be the last one to be so uncharitable as to misconstrue the minister's intentions.

I am quite fascinated because I think the initiative is quite a commendable one. But as I look through what you are going to be collecting under Judge Thomson, there are presumably a number of executive directors and executives that are presently in place. What is going to happen to that? There is going to be an interesting reshuffle, isn't there?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not necessarily. Those entire departments will be moved under his control. It doesn't necessarily mean there will be any movement within that particular department.

Mr. Conway: Is there not a concern that we are really not going to change the deck of cards but rather just have a grand shuffle? It seems to me we are just making a cosmetic adjustment to a problem that is more serious than that. We are simply going to take the various substructures that exist today, add a new titular head and let it stand at that. I am not so sure that will effectively change very much.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't anticipate that will happen. It is going to be a major change.

Mr. Conway: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You have been very kind in your indulgence.

Mr. Villeneuve: I just want to ask one question of the minister. Have you or your department any way of indicating what the effects of liquor advertising are? I get several complaints from people who are serious about it. They are very much opposed to so much of this publicity, particularly on the television over which we have no control. Is there any way you can barometer or gauge that, whether it increases the use of alcohol or lessens it or what? I am asked that very often and I am not in a position to answer.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that would be very difficult to assess really. It is sort of a very subjective judgement that would have to be made. We have had some meetings with the industry. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and I have met with them. They are most anxious to co-operate. As a matter of fact, at our last meeting it was decided that there would be a committee established with representatives from the industry. It will have the opportunity to look at all advertising to make judgements on that advertising and to see if in fact it is what is so-called lifestyle advertising. Outside of that, I think it is very difficult to suggest that it does have an influence in this field.

Mr. Villeneuve: I for one, as a non-drinker, would hate to see sports programmes given a curtailment against this advertising because today it is all beer or something else companies that promote sports and one thing and another. Here in the rural areas in particular people who are real temperance people condemn it. On the other hand, they have every right to think as they like. If they feel, with youth drinking as much as they are, that there is an increased use of alcohol, then we are just doing another



thing to play into their hands and encourage it.

[4:00]

**Mr. Jones:** Mr. Chairman, if I may, Mr. Villeneuve, the things that the select committee are just now looking at—the one I referred to earlier, highway safety and accident prevention—they are attempting to define, as best they are able, what is lifestyle. I think for the most part most of the members probably feel that lifestyle tends to be—the ones they find objectionable and the ones they feel probably are the most harmful—are in the area of design just toward young people. Very often the dune buggy setting, the handsome, good-looking gals and fellows, having a beer in the hand. They are trying to identify just what is lifestyle.

As I talk with young people as part of our process towards bringing this youth and alcohol report down, there is always this argument that we should just ban it—that is, bite the bullet—and that would solve the problem. Yet young people themselves said: “Just a moment; before you lurch out into that, think for a moment. Everywhere we go, if we travel in Europe or we go anywhere on this continent, we are going to be faced with alcohol. Isn’t it more appropriate that we should just have a proper balance?”

On the one hand we have the alcohol people telling us their advertising just causes people to switch brands. Well I think there’s some doubt in some quarters whether that is quite the case. These people have a lot of expertise. They can—and you will notice it, you mention the sports situation—they can do some very novel advertising that shows their brand, if that’s what they’re out to accomplish, without the heavy lifestyle that I know we found objectionable as we made our report. Some of it was just blatantly designed not only to affect—I don’t even think it affects the 15-, 16-, 17-, and 18-year-old as much as the 12- and 13-year-old. They learn the jingles very early and carry that forward.

What young people told us, over and over again, was, “Don’t sweep it under a rug or perhaps you just add to the mystique of the whole problem. Rather, tell us, on balance, both sides of the story. The advertising people over there for the alcohol companies are going to be telling us about their brand, and so on. Do as your government is doing, and do more of it, telling the other side of the coin, in a realistic way, some of the social bad effects, abuse of alcohol. Tell us the

difference between abuse versus just the use of it in society properly controlled.”

The young people said that to us over and over, and they continue to do so. So for what it’s worth, in the advertising side of things we are encouraged to see the alcohol companies starting to understand what they are being told. So we see some of them, on the back of major magazines, telling the story of Roger, or whoever he might be. On the one hand he has an exciting productive life ahead of him; on the other hand, if he does get involved in the abuse and isn’t careful about it, or gets conned with some of the advertising, how he could lose all those opportunities.

That’s what young people are saying: “Treat us like adults. Do have comment; and try to improve getting away from the heavy lifestyle, which is slanted too heavily in one direction, and tell us also about the other side of the coin so that we can make our choice.” Which eventually they are going to have to do in all matters in life.

I would think we agree with that concept, basically. The lifestyle approach we certainly found objectionable; and there were some important comments being made in the select committee, which you will see when they table their report about it, because they dealt with it to a considerable extent as well.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think indications are too, in jurisdictions where they have banned alcohol advertising, it hasn’t eliminated the problem.

**Mr. Villeneuve:** That’s what I’m looking for pretty much, because I’m at a loss pretty well. I do know this, that anything that goes on in my community, if there’s no liquor around you just don’t get a crowd; so that’s the problem.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I mentioned that committee that has been established. It has representation from the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Liquor Licence Board, the social development secretariat and the justice secretariat. The functions, put down in the terms of reference for the committee, are to review the new draft of the advertising and promotion directives prior to their promulgation, to assemble and analyse the available evidence regarding the effect of alcohol advertising and promotion, and to assist the Liquor Licence Board staff on an ongoing basis with the evaluation of advertising copy and promotions which do not clearly satisfy the intent of the directives. So I’m expecting that this

committee will be kept very busy looking at all future alcohol advertising.

**Mr. Villeneuve:** Well, I appreciate that item. You at least answered some of my problems now.

**Mr. Grande:** Mr. Chairman, it's impossible to know where to begin in this particular area, but I would like to focus my remarks on the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. I want to zero in primarily on the philosophy which this particular ministry seems to be embarking on.

Before I do that, I would like to ask a few questions. In terms of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, what have been the expenses for 1973, from the time that it was initiated, through 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977—given the fact that the order in council recommends that the members of the council shall receive remuneration at rates established by Management Board, plus reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred while engaged upon the business of the council. Would you have that information readily?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I'll have it.

**Mr. Grande:** All right.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If you'd just like to carry on we'll get it for you.

**Mr. Grande:** Certainly. The second question, as far as you're concerned what is a definition of multiculturalism?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That's a very difficult interpretation to really come by. Everyone seems to have their own interpretation of what it should be.

Mine is, it's many, many cultures, people from different parts of this world who have their own lifestyles, their own—and culture too is a very difficult thing to interpret and to explain, but it is a diversity of backgrounds, including language, lifestyle; I guess that's about the best that I could do for it.

**Mr. Grande:** Okay. Could you now enunciate your particular government policy on multiculturalism, as regards a definition? Obviously you cannot have a policy unless you define it in terms of what you want and in which direction you are going as a government. What does the government mean when it talks about the multicultural reality? What does the government mean when it talks about multiculturalism?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** The government, per se, has not to this moment introduced a policy statement on multiculturalism. There have

been many independent assessments about what a multicultural policy for Ontario should be. But I can just say to you that there will be, very shortly, a government policy on multiculturalism and what it means to Ontario.

**Mr. Grande:** Madam Minister, I see that since 1973 you have had this Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. Obviously the government intended, or had some kind of direction and some kind of terms of reference, some kind of work, that this advisory council was supposed to be doing. I've read the terms of reference in the order in council, I've read the report of the advisory council of 1974-75; we don't have any other report for 1976 as of yet, at least it's not been made public. What does the government mean, what does the government want?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** The whole intent of having an Advisory Council on Multiculturalism was to bring together those people with different backgrounds who have made Ontario and Canada their home, and ask for their advice on just how they felt they could become part of the overall population here in Ontario. We look to them for many areas of advice and look to their recommendations on just how they see a policy on multiculturalism.

**Mr. Grande:** I suppose that answer has to suffice for the time being, even though it's just as confusing as the many thousands of different definitions of multiculturalism.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I'm sure your definition would be quite different from mine.

**Mr. Grande:** I can assure you it is.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I'd be very interested to hear what yours is.

**Mr. Grande:** For one thing, I don't think we have time here to go into a particular discourse on what multiculturalism might mean in this society in Ontario, when we have approximately between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the people in this province who have neither an English nor a French background. Nevertheless, those particular 20 per cent of the people have found themselves at all times, as far as their culture and as far as their language are concerned, at the margin, in a sense outside of the circle of this particular province and the modus operandi of this particular province.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** One of the basic reasons for having an Advisory Council on Multicul-



turalism was to make sure that those very people did become part and did have an opportunity to express their own cultural backgrounds, and this is happening.

**Mr. Grande:** The problem I have is that we've had enough studies. We've had enough advisory councils. We have the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism which has come down with very definitive types of recommendations, and what we find is that the federal government dismisses it. We find the parallel here in the province of Ontario with the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. The province is dismissing it.

Let me suggest to you that those particular people on this advisory council—and I know the chairman of the advisory council very well—find themselves totally frustrated. I monitor this council very closely. The council members on many occasions—as a matter of fact, in 1976—came to the particular point that they did not know what on earth the government wanted them to do. If you recall, and I'm sure you do, the council under the leadership of Mr. Chekeris sent you a letter, sent the Minister of Health a letter and sent the Minister of Community and Social Services a letter in terms of saying, "What are we supposed to do here?"

The answer that comes from this particular ministry is, "Whatever you're doing is in line with our thinking." This suggests to me that this particular group of well-intentioned people supposedly should be there as an autonomous body, supposedly should be there to make recommendations to government and then government should decide whether those recommendations should be accepted or rejected. But what they're finding ultimately is that those particular recommendations that they made—and I can read the particular recommendations in 1974, and they were explicit in those recommendations—have been completely unheard by government.

What you find in the 1975 report is that they've watered down those particular recommendations, you know, or I hope you know, as far as multiculturalism is concerned and as far as a policy for multiculturalism is concerned, unless you take seriously the language of the particular cultural group and the culture of that particular cultural group and encourage it, then you really have no multiculturalism. What you have is nothing else but an assimilation process, and that's all there is to it.

As a matter of fact, I was very interested in hearing you, in terms of your definition, because it implied nothing else but an assimilation process.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't think you were listening very carefully because I too expressed the feeling that language was very important.

**Mr. Grande:** Oh, you did. But then when you spoke in terms of what this particular group or advisory council ought to be doing, you said in hearing from the cultural groups that they should do what they think they ought to do to become part of this total picture that is Ontario.

[4:15]

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** In sharing their cultural backgrounds with the rest of Ontario.

**Mr. Grande:** Well, may I suggest to you that I cannot share my culture and my language with you until you begin, and I don't mean you in specifics, to treat my culture and my language on equal terms. Until that happens, and I hope that it will happen, at least I am committed to be working toward that, until that happens I cannot share my culture with you.

The interesting thing was that when that member on the other side, Mr. Conway, was talking about what multiculturalism means, you talked about your experiences in Scarborough. I appreciate the fact that you are from Scarborough so you know that particular area much better. You talked about sharing of cultures. Do you understand, or do you know, that 90 per cent of the kids, of the students in the elementary schools who are in schools right now, were born in Canada and know no other country other than Canada? What kind of culture could they share other than the culture that they have around them—which is not the particular culture of their ancestors; as a matter of fact they have lost that totally, completely.

Let me get into this field. I would like to make some observations and the observations stem from the federal government, and they go to the provincial government and they go to the local boards of education. As you recall, in 1969 the bi-bi- commission came out with a report, the fourth report on other groups in Canada, which suggested that the language of the cultural group has to be taken seriously into consideration in the school system. They made that recommendation very explicit.

The federal government was not willing to go with that kind of recommendation. So they set up this Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Two years later the Consultative Council on Multiculturalism came down with exactly the same recommendation which said language is very important, and anything less than that is nothing else but truncated multiculturalism. The federal government disbanded, or almost disbanded, the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism; and the ministry of multiculturalism, as you recall under the minister Stanley Haidasz, was completely disbanded. They had no need of it any more, their political objectives had been reached and had been achieved. Because really, what the federal government set up, and you know it and I know it, was a grant system to encourage folklore, nothing else. Folklore is the most superficial part of language; it's vestiges of culture, that's what it is, vestiges of a culture.

Now the provincial government follows exactly those same steps that the federal government followed. I have a mass of information here; but anyway, taking the annual report of the council in 1974, they said: "The unanimous decision of the committee was that the encouragement of a knowledge of a third language would not only benefit the individual but would benefit Ontario and Canada."

Now what has your government done in terms of making sure that this particular recommendation and this particular policy took effect in the school system? I know about 1972. I know Mr. Davis, and who was the other minister, Mr. Welch, talked about the introduction of these courses in the high school system, and that's where they left it.

Whenever we talk about the public elementary school system, the government goes completely apoplectic. They just don't know how to deal with it. Somehow it would destroy society if we ever allowed that kind of thing to take place. I suggest to you that the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), in this multicultural policy report, or multicultural policy that he is going to be bringing forth—in two weeks or one week or a month or three months, or whenever he's going to bring it, because he has been talking about it since 1975.

In his estimates of November 1975 he said: "Look, if these estimates had been in two months we would have this policy ready." In June 1976, when we had those estimates: "We still need some more time.

This particular internal committee is working, we still need some more time." And in December 1976 he still said he doesn't have it ready.

What I suggested at that particular time—and I'm sure I won't be proven wrong—is that that particular policy is going to be announced during an election campaign in this province; and that multicultural policy is going to take the place of the Hon. William Davis' trip to Italy in 1974-75. This is going to be a policy of the Hon. William Davis going around the globe.

It just bothers me a bit; it bothers me a bit because if you really, as a government, believe in this kind of direction—look, I understand the politics of the thing, I really do—but if you really do understand it and do want to move in a different direction, then for heaven's sakes you've got it ready, it's at the printer, it's been at the printer for a month. I know that, and you know that. Why is it that you're holding it off so that just when the election is called the big announcement comes of this multicultural policy?

When you take a look at that multicultural policy—I haven't looked at it, I did not get any brown envelope from anywhere—but when you take a look at that multicultural policy, you know what it's going to have? It's going to have just empty words, just empty policy. Just like the minister said yesterday in the House: We encourage the schools to do this, but in no way are we going to give the schools the funds with which to do the work.

The minister talks about this province spending more tax dollars on education than any other part of the globe or any other part of the world. Yet privately he has been talking to me and I've been talking to him and he knows that until he puts some funds in that particular development, in that particular direction, the school boards ain't going to move, in the very colloquial. They're just not going to move, they're not going to do a thing. So whatever policy the minister might have or the minister might develop, the school boards certainly are not going to be doing a thing.

The most important thing that is disturbing is that in December 1976 this internal multicultural committee that exists in the Ministry of Education has gone to the federal government to negotiate the old federal-provincial—what is it, regarding textbooks, regarding adult education, where the federal government provides 50 per cent of



books and instruction in third language for adults?

Now at that particular time, and the document is right here, at that particular time what the minister was talking about to the federal government was: Look, we have so many of these children at the elementary schools, as a matter of fact we have 24,831 who need English as a second language course in the schools. And what happened? They figured out the costing, the whole thing, they figured out that the federal government should be turning over to the province \$10 million in order to do an adequate job.

That was in December. Mr. Fisher, in the Ministry of Education, was saying to me months ago that this was in its state of finality, coming close to the state of finality. Now I suspect, and I suppose you will say that I'm wrong, I suspect that what happened is that the federal government turned over this \$10 million to the province (a) to increase English as a second language, (b) to increase special education classes in the schools, in terms of the compensatory education component in the weighting factors, and (c) to begin the work in the schools about third languages.

Why is the minister holding back? The funds are there. The federal government has given them the funds. Do you know why the federal government has done that? Because the federal government last week initiated once again a ministry of multiculturalism. For heaven's sake, I don't think the federal government would make such a move unless it could spell out that that's the kind of thing it is doing for the provinces for multiculturalism. The policy has been written up for a month, to say the least. The money has come from the federal government. Why is the minister holding back?

We know why the minister is holding back. If during the expected provincial election, the Minister of Education is not going to make that kind of a statement in a fanfare, that he has some money to set up pilot programmes in certain of the schools and that there is some money that the boards of education can avail themselves of in some of the schools to initiate these kinds of programmes, then when we come back to this House I would like you to prove me wrong.

Three days ago I had the really fantastic experience—it was a treat for me—to be sitting with a group of people at a conference on multiculturalism in education at one of the hotels here in Toronto. The incredible thing is that we started to talk about philosophy

and what multiculturalism is. The leaders in those particular groups wanted to deter the group completely from language learning in the schools.

I don't know what you're afraid of. I don't know what they are afraid of. That's exactly the intention they have. Finally, some of the people just became frustrated and said, "Look, I would like a vote in this particular group." The vote was on, "Do you think that both the federal government and the provincial governments are paying lip service to multiculturalism?" Ninety-five per cent of those people believed that that was so—lip service and nothing else. As a matter of fact, it is lip service for political expediency.

When that kind of policy is needed for political gain—and you have that policy and the federal government has that policy—then after the political gain has been gained—and, by the way, I don't think that you will, but that's an aside—when that political benefit has accrued, then you say, "Now we can rest assured. We can forget about it. We can set up another advisory council or some form of council on multiculturalism and say to the people out there we have something going. We have the advisory council. We have the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. We're going to come in with a policy," and in three years time the policy is not going to be in place.

I can go on for about two or three hours on, as far as I'm concerned, this very important subject. The provincial government as far as a multiculturalism policy goes is a complete wasteland. That is the only way that it can be described. And do you know why? Because you don't believe in it. You really don't believe in it. If your people look at this document—by the way, the person, as a matter of fact, was one of the higher people in the Ministry of Education that sent it to me just for information purposes—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** In a brown envelope?

**Mr. Grande:** No. It's not a brown envelope at all. Right at the top it's scratched out, put out with invisible typewriter ink. It was "Government of Ontario." The gentleman was very careful in saying to me, "This is something we're doing in terms of negotiating. It's not the policy of the government." I know differently. I know this is the policy of the government. What it says at the end sums up the whole philosophy of the provincial government in terms of multiculturalism. And do you know what it says? "Efforts should also be undertaken to publicize our ac-

tivities in the field of immigrant assimilation so that maximum benefits can be derived from our efforts in this activity."

[4:30]

Immigrant assimilation, and the hon. Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch), and the Minister of Education, and you yourself can say you really don't mean assimilation but, deep down, that's exactly what you want. Deep down, your whole philosophy is geared towards the cultural destruction of the different cultural groups in this province. You prove me wrong, because I've seen it taking place over and over again for the past seven or eight years in the educational system. I could document these cases.

As I said in the Legislature about rent control—and I'm not getting off the topic, Mr. Chairman, at all—this government doesn't believe in it. Why bring it in? Why aren't you honest—and I don't mean to say that you're not—why aren't you honest and say assimilation is really what you're talking about, assimilation is the goal? Because in reality it's happening and the only way that you can solve this particular—I don't want to call it a problem because it isn't a problem; because you know what it is, it's an enrichment of Canadian society as far as I'm concerned.

The fact that I'm here, Madam Minister, enriches the Canadian society. Not that I'm in this Legislature but I'm in this country, it enriches Canadian society. It enriches Canadian society in terms of cultural enrichment and in terms of linguistic enrichment. Don't say to me that the mother tongue of a child is encouraged in the schools. You know it isn't. You know it's never meant to be. All I'm saying is, just say it, say that's what the provincial government's decision is in terms of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is nothing else but some kind of a theoretical concept which will stay suspended in mid air for a long time and we'll begin to pull it down a little bit when it's politically expedient for us, because you don't believe it.

So this Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, as far as I'm concerned, is just another means for you to be saying: "We are working on the problem." The internal committee of the Minister of Education is nothing else but a tool to say, "We are working on your concerns. We're going to do something about it."

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** If I could just make a comment on that—

**Mr. Grande:** I promise I will give you the time.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Fine, because there's something you have said that I just can't let pass.

**Mr. Grande:** Sure, certainly.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I mean there are several things you said that I can't let pass.

**Mr. Grande:** I'm sure there are quite a lot of things I've said that you will not let pass, but you will have your opportunity, I'm sure.

In the Speech from the Throne, Her Honour said: "Increased emphasis on language opportunities will be reflected in innovations that recognize the multicultural nature of our population." They are beautiful words. "More resources will be available for intensive English-language instruction for children of recent immigrants. At the same time, while recognizing that French and English are the languages of instruction in Ontario schools, our heritage language programme will be supported as a continuing education offering."

There are the key words—"a continuing education offering." That triggers my mind to think: "Ah, the federal government has given the province of Ontario the \$10 million and they're going to be making use of that \$10 million to improve the ESL programmes and to provide for the third languages in the schools, these pilot programmes." In other words, the province of Ontario is not going to be spending a red cent. It has been waiting a long time for the federal government to give it the money and then it will have the political splash, saying: "Look what we are doing."

Never in the history of education—I don't know if it's in the history of education; I want to take that expression or that phrase back—never as far as I am aware in education have any programmes in the elementary schools been financed by a continuing education function; never. Because they are two different and distinct types of education; one is for adults, for which we know the federal government gives this province 50 per cent of the moneys, and the other one is for education, for which we know supposedly the federal government gives no money to the province because it is a responsibility, according to The British North America Act, of the provinces.

Yet the minister in a very creative way, may I say, is using the federal money for the heritage language programme and paying it with continuing education funds. It's a fantastic piece of work. I don't know whether the federal government, as soon as it hears of



this kind of thing, is going to be saying, "Hey, look, what's going on there?" I guess that remains to be seen.

The Minister of Education yesterday in the Legislature said a few things to me to indicate that not everything we do in this province requires money. I hear the same thing from the member for Mississauga North—"Not everything we do in this province requires money. We just do the policy and then let the educational system take care of it." Yet in the budget—and I don't remember which page it is—the Treasurer of this province said it is because of the schools that the property tax increased so much last year. In other words, on the one hand you give more functions to the educational system to perform, and on the other hand you put the educational system down by saying you are spending too much money. You are trying to get out of that kind of discrepancy in the thinking of the Treasurer.

It's fashionable, though, to just hit the educational system, to be hitting the teaching profession with all kinds of functions that they should be performing; very fashionable. It might be politically astute too, because the educational system is not well liked by very many people in the province. I think you are wrong.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I wouldn't say that.

**Mr. Grande:** I think you are wrong that one day those particular things you are saying are going to be proved correct. On one hand, you say to the educational system, "perform this task, perform this function," and on the other hand you slap the educational system for increasing the property tax. How do you get away with that? Don't the people of this province understand it? I believe they do. Do you think the schools are just going to take that kind of statement lying down?

I leave that as it is, but please, whenever you ask the schools in terms of either fighting racism which is one of the things that really we should all be concentrating on, but you know racism is nothing else but a symptom of this society; racism goes down deep into the economic factors of this society; racism begins and shows its ugly head when the economic conditions—like unemployment, like housing, like all of the economic factors that go into making this society—have not had proper direction from the business community or proper direction from the government here. In other words, don't say we must tackle and we should get the schools to tackle racism and then turn around and say 200,000 people are unemployed in this province but

it's okay for the government. As a matter of fact, we don't even count those 200,000 people as being not unemployed.

It reminds me of the French lady, Marie Antoinette, when at one particular time when the people were banging at the door of the palace, her advisers went up to her and said, "The people are asking for bread," and Marie Antoinette said, "Give them cake. Let them eat cake." That showed that Marie Antoinette just did not understand the reality of that particular country at that particular time in its history.

I don't want to get off the topic and I promise I will go back to multiculturalism as soon as I make this comment. When the Treasurer says that as far as he is concerned having 200,000 people in this province unemployed is full unemployment, that's exactly what the Treasurer has done. He has misunderstood the mood of the people and misread reality.

I suggest to you that in terms of your policy of multiculturalism, you really misunderstood; perhaps you have never understood the reality of this province.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** There is no point in trying to get into a point-by-point reply to the comments of the hon. member but I would just like to suggest that I think he does a disservice to the members of that Advisory Council on Multiculturalism.

**Mr. Grande:** I said initially that Dr. Korey is a fantastic person. I said initially, if I may, Mr. Chairman, because I just don't take that kind of remark too lightly, that those people are well-intentioned people. I did say that and you can look back in Hansard and find that out.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think your comments about the fact they didn't know what they had been appointed for to the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism is a disservice to that group because these are leaders of different ethnic groups throughout this province. These are very well qualified, intelligent people who wouldn't undertake—

**Mr. McClellan:** Why do you ignore their recommendations?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't think we have ignored their recommendations.

**Mr. Grande:** You are getting me to go on for another half an hour.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Good. I would like to point out to you that I think the Advisory Council of Multiculturalism is made up of

people of great understanding of the needs of the ethnic community.

**Mr. Grande:** I will grant you that.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think that they are providing very excellent recommendations and advice to this government.

**Mr. McClellan:** You are the ones who don't understand.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think we understand. I think the misunderstanding comes from somewhere else. I would just like to point out you did read from a paper you said had been given to you from someone within the Ministry of Education. I would like to remind you that papers and memos given to you by civil servants within this government do not necessarily mean they have anything to do with policy. They are discussion papers. They might have taken place at some staff level between this government and the federal government. I don't know, but I would just like to underline the fact that that doesn't mean it has anything to do with the policy that is about to be announced.

You asked for some figures on the expenses of the multicultural council. In 1973-74—it commenced during the year—the actual expenses were \$26,000. In 1974-75, the estimates were \$113,000; the actual, \$106,000. In 1975-76, estimates were \$113,000; actual, \$99,000. In 1976-77, estimates were \$113,500; actual, \$108,000. So far this year, 1977-78, estimates are \$131,000. I would like to point out that the increase in the estimates is due to a new staff member and a larger number of members on the council.

[4:45]

**Mr. Grande:** I realize the time constraints, but as to the kind of thing that you were saying about me doing a disservice to these people, I guess Hansard will prove whether I have done a disservice to those people or not. I firmly believe that I said those people are well-intentioned people doing their work. But what happens is, because you do not take into account seriously their recommendations, they are becoming frustrated. They don't know in which direction to go. As a matter of fact, let's take a leaf from the report of particular monthly meetings, which say: "Future directions. Hon. Margaret Birch and four related ministers have been asked to supply the council with lists of major concerns to assist the council in determining priorities for the forthcoming year."

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** And does it state in that paper what my response was to them?

**Mr. Grande:** It certainly does. There is a letter in the addendum of your response. As a matter of fact I give you credit for saying, "Look, this is your work."

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That's right. Why don't you read that into the record?

**Mr. Grande:** I could very easily read that but—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** This is an advisory council made up outside government. If we wanted information of this kind to develop policy, we have it. We have it available within the ministries of this government. But because we want to involve people outside government, because we want the recommendations to come from them, from the people involved, we have advisory councils. They are at arm's length from government. We do not interfere. We do not direct them. We ask them to determine their own priorities and to establish their own recommendations. I do not interfere with any of the advisory councils.

**Mr. Grande:** In 1976 this group of well-intentioned people—and I repeat that phrase—got together at one particular meeting and they said, "Look, we don't know which direction we are going. We really don't know which direction we should be going." So therefore they decided to break down into four different groups, and they had phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3. This is what one of the groups decided—group 2. It says, "Concern: Where the council is going and what we mean to government. Are we a token?"

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** But that is a legitimate concern of an advisory council.

**Mr. McClellan:** Especially this government.

**Mr. Grande:** But you see, Madam Minister, that was in 1976—three years after this council was set up.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think you should appreciate too that there are new members coming on to that council; there was a new chairman. Each individual person has a different approach to what he is expected to do; their priorities are quite different. There is a turnover every year of members of that council.

**Mr. Grande:** I understand that you are misunderstanding what I am talking about. I understand it. After a group of people meets from 1973 to 1977 to determine multicultural policy for this government, in 1976 this group says, "We don't know which direction we should be going. Let us send letters to the



different ministries so then the different ministries will tell us, will give us some direction." It is not those people in that particular group who are saying, "We don't know in what direction we should be going." They are saying, "We gave the minister recommendations in 1974 and they have been completely avoided, so what is the point of going through that exercise again?"

Really, when you talk of multiculturalism—and the evidence is so thick, coming from the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Quebec, many different states in the United States, South Africa, Sweden, all over the world; the literature is so thick on bilingualism and multiculturalism—these people are saying the fundamental things that should be tackled are culture and language, and let's not fool around about it. Let us not go around in circles and come to it 10 years from now. Those are crucial things that we have to tackle and we have to tackle now, and we have to get this government to understand it.

Up to now you haven't understood this. I think maybe the Minister of Education is going to be throwing out this multicultural policy for the wrong reasons. If it might mean one or two or three or 10 seats for you after the next election, as far as you are concerned you have accomplished your reasons, you have accomplished the reason why you are putting forth this multicultural policy. I repeat, I cannot understand why a policy that has been ready for at least a month—it's been at the printer and is ready right now—why a policy that you've had an advisory council on since 1973—the Minister of Education has had an internal committee on multiculturalism for the last two years—why is it that policy comes at this particular time in Ontario? Why did it not come last year? Why did it not come in 1975?

I leave it up to you to determine the motivation behind why that policy is coming now.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I guess it's very difficult for you to understand, perhaps, the introduction of new policy—

**Mr. Grande:** All too well, as a matter of fact.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** —because you have never been a member of government responsible and, you know, I don't expect you will be for some time. There's more to just introducing policy. There's a long series of determinations that have to be made.

**Mr. Grande:** You introduce direction, then you let the boards of education across this province determine their priorities, but at least there is intent from this government in which direction education ought to be going in this province. The problem has been, as I said before, it has been devoid, it has been a wasteland in this province in terms of a multicultural policy, and you know it.

You said that the New Democratic Party will not likely form a government. Hah, perhaps you're right, I don't know.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** It's just an observation.

**Mr. Grande:** Sure, sure, and you're entitled to that observation, as I am entitled to my observation, which is that it might not be this time that we form the government, but we will form the government in this province.

As far as I am concerned, as far as the New Democratic Party in this province is concerned, there definitely are certain things that the government ought to be doing and the government ought to be encouraging. So I am going to put to you the educational policy and the multicultural policy of the New Democratic Party. Some of it has been enshrined in resolutions and it is policy of the party. Some of it is not, I admit to you.

The kinds of things we have to consider in a multicultural policy are these: Immigrant parents want the schools to teach their children English; teaching English as a second language must be expanded; the school board must have the funds for those programmes. The school boards right now, even though they want to increase or expand the English-as-a-second-language classes, you know and I know that last week they had to let go 21 English-as-a-second-language teachers in the schools. They also had to let go 30 or 40 special education teachers in the schools.

The renegotiation of the federal-provincial programme: One of the definite things you must do is to increase the weighting factor, because the compensatory education weighting factor does not take into account only English as a second language. So you should have a different weighting factor for English as a second language.

The Minister of Education should research other programmes aimed at teaching students English. For many years we thought the direct approach—the English immersion approach—was the one that worked best. The Minister of Education is now beginning to see there are other alternatives that work just as well. I am referring to the mother-tongue-to-English programmes. There is a whole rationale and I am sure you can get that kind

of information if you look back in Hansard in November 1975.

Number two, immigrant parents also want their children to retain or maintain the language and culture of origin. Becoming Canadian does not mean and must not mean abandonment and destruction of the original language and culture. The wealth of languages and cultures we have in Ontario must be supported. And to this end, in order for that to take place, the Minister of Education has to provide funds to initiate pilot third-language programmes where the number of students is sufficient to make the programme feasible at the elementary level.

The Minister of Education should be moving with speed to amend The Education Act, to permit the teaching of languages other than English and French at all levels, particularly in elementary schools in response to community interest, as well as to permit their use by teachers for the purpose of facilitating instruction where it is in the best interest of the student.

I pointed out earlier that Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan have changed the Act. I don't have to go far afield, I stay within Canada; those three provinces have changed the Act to allow for that kind of thing to go on.

The next thing is the teachers' colleges. Teachers should be trained so that they are knowledgeable in the way of the multicultural makeup of their classes. One of the things that the Ministry of Education has to do is to initiate courses at teachers' colleges to begin to give prospective teachers an idea, an understanding, a respect for the cultural backgrounds in this province, in other words courses in multicultural education.

This particular summer the Minister of Education established that kind, of course. Many people were called from different boards of education to come to the Mowat Block I believe, and to give their input in terms of setting up these courses, what the course content ought to be. It was particularly aimed at giving this course as a summer course to teachers who were already in the system and working.

You know what happened? Seven of those teachers in the whole of Metro said they were interested in that kind of course—seven.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Out of how many?

Mr. Grande: Well, you know how many teachers are in Metropolitan Toronto. Seven of those teachers said they were interested, which seems to give me an indication of where multiculturalism is in this province and where you have placed multicuture.

Now if that kind of course, I say through you to the Minister of Education, is a valid course, why isn't it put into the teachers' colleges. At least there you have the teachers who are going to be going into the schools in years hence and they would have some kind of an understanding of what their classes would be.

So in terms of education those are the kinds of things that the New Democratic Party will be doing. There are many other kinds—

Mr. Bullbrook: You had me until that last line.

Mr. McClellan: He's just reading.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was on your side, I thought, until that last line.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: A bit of party doctrine there.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh this is the party doctrine.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh yes.

Mr. Grande: What is your problem?

Mr. Bullbrook: I apologize for interrupting you in full flight.

Mr. Grande: The Advisory Council on Multiculturalism has said to you over and over again: "Drop those particular laws and amendments in the province of Ontario that are discriminatory." Those are recommendations in their report, not necessarily in their report but in their month-to-month meetings. As far as I'm concerned you've got to drop the amendment that you had last year to the guaranteed annual income supplement. You've just got to drop that, because that amendment is discriminatory at its best.

For the time being, Madam Minister, I suppose I've given you some idea of which direction the New Democratic Party will be going, and in which direction I think you as a government should be going, at least until next week.

Mr. McClellan: I see I have 35 seconds. Was arrangement to adjourn at 5 o'clock because of considerations of the minister or of the chairman?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The chairman.

Mr. McClellan: Is it possible to continue or is that inconvenient?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's inconvenient now because I have a speaking engagement to-



night and once he indicated 5:30 I made other arrangements.

**Mr. McClellan:** Are we going till 5:30?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't know whether it's 5 or 5:30.

**Mr. McClellan:** Can we go till 5:30? I wanted to make a few remarks, again in relation to senior citizens services, if you'll give me a second to shuffle my papers here.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Mr. Chairman, while he's shuffling his papers could I just have two seconds?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

**Ms. Sandeman:** The minister's closing comments to me after our discussion on senior citizens were that she didn't hear too many people coming and saying they were unhappy. May I just read to you from the first report of the Advisory Council on Senior Citizens?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** The first report? When was that dated?

**Ms. Sandeman:** It is 1974-75, on the income maintenance committee.

"To be old in the early 1900s meant that you had reached the epitome of life. You had earned respect, affection and were proud and welcome to share in the culture and activities in your community with children and/or neighbours. Many sought your advice, others were interested in your past experiences, your stories, your accomplishments and your failures. You had prestige. In a word, you were loved and respected, you had dignity and belonged.

"This is not the life of today's pensioners. Our image has changed. Many elderly today are cast aside, forgotten like a worn-out shoe, feel lost, lonely, degraded and afraid to spend those dollars saved for burial or that rainy day; afraid of the fast changing world, inflation, vanishing purchasing power, complex forms, means test, needs test, inadequate health services, waiting periods to obtain accommodation; afraid of being uprooted and institutionalized.

"Many of these fears might be eliminated if seniors had adequate income with the same purchasing power they had the day they retired."

I don't think we can discount that. That is from a group you have set to represent the feeling of senior citizens in this province. They don't put a number on it, they say

"many"; and while that group is saying many let's not minimize the problem.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't think we ever do minimize the problem. We're constantly aware and trying to make things better for that minimal number of senior citizens across this province who do require special attention. But I just don't want the impression to be left that every senior citizen in this province is depending on government or some agency of government in order to survive. That is just not so and I will not accept it.

**Ms. Sandeman:** Nobody has made that suggestion.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, but that is the general impression that some seem to be trying to leave, and I just think it's unfortunate. I think it is a disservice to the many senior citizens across the province who are able to remain independent.

**Mr. McClellan:** If you want to engage in that kind of complacency, I'll remind you again what's said in your interministry report on residential services, because that's what we're talking about.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** That refers to the provision of services; it doesn't talk about income maintenance, it doesn't talk about a lot of the other programmes.

**Mr. McClellan:** I'm afraid it does talk about income maintenance, and let me just refresh your memory since you seem to want to forget what I can only describe as an absolute condemnation of Ontario's social policy with respect to senior citizens.

They talk, on page 50, of the wasteful competition that exists, about the jockeying for admission, about the institutional gamesmanship. They talk about the absurdities of present funding arrangements, they talk about the wide varieties of legislation, standards and so on. They go on to say: "Perhaps the most serious matter is the lack of non-residential alternatives. Despite the established trend away from institutional care, Ontario gives its seniors a strong financial incentive to go inside, especially those on extended care.

"Firstly, they are able to live in the style that they would be unable to pay for in the community out of OAS-GIA, GAINS, family benefits and pension. Secondly, many of them can save money while in residence. In Toronto alone, funds held in trust for residents of homes for the aged in extended care, saved out of comfort allowance alone, are estimated to be growing at over \$1 million a year";

and so on. "In the meantime, the aged person in the community can barely make ends meet and has extremely little in the way of service to help him stay there."

If that isn't a total condemnation of Ontario's income maintenance programme, I don't know how you could express it any more strongly. What you have is the deputy minister of your Ministry of Community and Social Services and senior officials across five ministries saying the aged in Ontario can barely make ends meet.

They go on to say in the appendix on page 82; "A number of studies in Canada and observations of services actually established, particularly in the western provinces, suggest that services like visiting nurses, home help, handymen or women, meals on wheels, house cleaning, visiting, telephone callers, pension, legal and tax counselling could help many elderly persons remain in their own homes where the majority of them prefer to be. These services are poorly developed in some Ontario centres and virtually not at all in most."

That is what your own senior officials are telling you. So don't give us that kind of complacency. That's what we are addressing right now.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I am not giving it any indication of that.

**Mr. McClellan:** We resent very much attempts to distort what we are addressing ourselves to.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I have addressed myself to this very situation. I have indicated to you that we are concerned. We are concerned about the many inequities in the system of the provisions of services and the services that will give senior citizens alternatives of staying in their own homes. We have already addressed that. I have indicated to you that we are very interested and that we will be coming forward with some new directions for that whole policy.

**Mr. McClellan:** With respect, we have not seen any initiatives yet that make any sense in terms of an adequate geriatric care system.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** An increase of \$10 million in home care over the last two years. Is that not an indication? There are many programmes of meals on wheels that are being subsidized by this government and the many, many programmes that I have indicated to you.

**Mr. McClellan:** If we had an adequate system of geriatric care in this province, we

wouldn't have something like the inter-ministerial report coming out with an indication that as many as 30 or 30 per cent of people in residential care need not be there, if there were adequate community-based personal support services.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think you and your party will have to share some of the blame for the way that many of the institutions have sprung up across this province. I think that you have to share with us the pressures of different groups to provide more and more institutional care for more and more people. Every time a problem is brought to someone's attention, it seems that an institution is going to answer that question. We are only beginning to recognize that that is not the way to do it.

**Mr. McClellan:** I invite you to run on your own record and we will run on the record of what we have said and what we have done.

**Mr. Conway:** Socialism.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Everything for everybody.

**Mr. McClellan:** Spit it out.

**Mr. Conway:** Red as red can be.

**Mr. Bullbrook:** I don't think Mr. Conway should be permitted to join the discussion on the aged.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, I don't think so. He has had little experience.

**Mr. McClellan:** Since time is fleeting, let me try to spell out very precisely what a coherent geriatric service system might look like. If I can pass this on to the minister, she can have a look at it. It's from a study that was done by the provincial gerontologist for the province of Saskatchewan, Dr. S. L. Skoll. It is from a publication of the government of Saskatchewan called "Adding Years to Life". It presents all of the elements of a complete care service system for the aged. It is the kind of system that this society needs to develop, and develop very quickly, if we are to get away from the custodial bias that still dominates policy with respect to the elderly, if we are ever to get away from the remnants of a poor-law mentality that still governs policy in this province, in terms of the programmes that are available.

In my own riding of Bellwoods, it was only some three weeks ago now that Lambert Lodge fell to the wrecker's ball. You may



recall that Lambert Lodge was the original poor house for the corporation of the city of Toronto. When we moved beyond the poor laws and we no longer incarcerated the indigent in poor houses, it became the home for the aged for the corporation of the city of Toronto. It remained as a home for the aged for many years. It was finally closed because it was in a state of absolute dilapidation and an absolute disgrace. But it remained standing until three weeks ago as a kind of visible symbol of how our social policy for the elderly has developed.

We haven't really moved away from that yet. If you look in comparison terms at the budget of Community and Social Services, they spend something on the order of, just to round things off, \$100 million for institutional facilities for the elderly, and something on the order of—you say \$10 million; I can't find it in there but maybe we'll come back to that after I complete my remarks.

The material that I gave you from Dr. Skoll presents, under four categories, the kinds of services that need to be developed in order to keep elderly people in their own homes. He's ranged them under four categories—health, social services, community services and housing services. Each of these has to be available by way of support to an elderly person in his own home.

Our geriatric care service system needs to be based on three basic principles: First, the elderly require a multiplicity of services and facilities available to them in their own homes, in their own communities; secondly, joint planning and co-ordination at the local level, with input for the elderly, has to be the basis for the care system for the elderly; thirdly, the objective of social policy and of the programmes for the elderly have to be to maintain health and social well-being of the aged in their own homes and in their own communities for as long as possible.

That ought to be the basis, the stated basis, of government policy.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** It is. We are very well aware of this report.

**Mr. McClellan:** It is not. With respect, it is not.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** We're very well aware of this report.

**Mr. McClellan:** You may be well aware of it, but it has not been stated in any coherent way and in any public document as the basis of Ontario government policy for the aged, and more importantly—

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I told you—

**Mr. McClellan:** Let me finish. You'll have a chance to respond. Don't heckle.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** It's quite all right when the heckling comes from your side, is it?

**Mr. Conway:** With all due respect to the member for Bellwoods, it's the kettle calling the pot black I should think.

**Mr. McClellan:** I couldn't avoid it.

**Mr. Bullbrook:** This is almost a reverse déjà vu for me, you know. I don't want to dwell on my own age, but a decade ago your party spokesmen were decrying the lack of institutional facilities provided by this government. It's a no-win proposition, as far as you people are concerned, for this minister.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Absolutely. That's what I hoped that—

**Mr. Bullbrook:** I apologize for interrupting.

**Mr. McClellan:** I'm pleased to see that you haven't abandoned your position of apologizing for the government, even in the estimates debates.

**Mr. Bullbrook:** I find it an honour and a pleasure to be supportive of this minister, if that's what you mean.

**Mr. McClellan:** That's your privilege.

Let me go on to suggest that the minister should fundamentally revise the basis of elderly persons service policy and move quickly to match that policy with resources and dollars and structures that would make it possible to set in place the following kinds of services: the kinds of health services that would make available public health nurses and home care nurses to the elderly in their own homes; medical-social work staff and hospital services; assessment, diagnostic and therapeutic services that would be available on an out-patient basis for people who are able then to receive adequate medicare and still remain in their own homes; and, as has been mentioned as well, adequate chiropody services.

Under the rubric of social services you need to develop an adequate network of day centres and meals on wheels, luncheon clubs, home help services, residential homes, night-sitters, laundry services and income support services.

[5:15]

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** It's making more sense.

**Mr. McClellan:** Well, if you think that rattling radiator makes more sense than the listing of an array of personal support services for the elderly, is that what you're saying? Or an adequate network of community services, home nursing services, neighbourhood visitors, hobbycraft centres, volunteer activities, again chiropody services, adult education services, re-employment strategies for the elderly; under housing services, an adequate network of home aids, of home adaptations, of what are called in Dr. Skoll's schematic diagram neighbourhood wardens, shelter departments and sheltered housing.

All these things have to be available and I fail to understand the kind of cynical and smirky reception that this kind of presentation has been greeted with here this afternoon by the two other parties. It's somewhat baffling. But nevertheless—

**Mr. Conway:** It's a figment of your own partisan imagination.

**Mr. McClellan:** I hope so.

**Mr. Conway:** Sure.

**Mr. McClellan:** That's not the gist of what the member for Sarnia was saying.

**Mr. Conway:** Well, we wouldn't accuse you of the same social tendencies or policies as the member for High Park and I think it's equally uncharitable of you to be so extrapolative in your own suggestions. It's quite undignified for a very good and honourable member.

**Mr. McClellan:** Well, for their lack of charity then. But none of these services is adequately developed in this province. None of these services is even minimally funded. When you talk about increasing the budgets of visiting homemaker services—I'm not exactly sure what you said, whether you said they had been increased by \$10 million or to \$10 million over the last two years.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Could I explain to you just exactly what I did say? Community and Social Services increased from \$5 million in 1976-77 to \$7,763,600 in 1977-78, an increase of \$2,763,600. That was for homemakers of Community and Social Services.

**Mr. McClellan:** Where does that show up in the estimates book?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I don't have the estimates of Community and Social Services. That's something you'll have to look at in the estimates of the social policy field.

**Mr. McClellan:** How did you arrive at that figure? Which range of programmes is computed into those figures?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** This is for homemakers and nurses services under that particular Act. Then in the home care programme of the Ministry of Health, which is an alternative programme to hospitalization, in 1975-76 the budget was \$13,009,200; in 1976-77, including the supplementary estimates, the budget was \$18,680,500. For 1977-78, the budget will be \$23,700,000, an increase of over \$10 million in two years for that particular programme.

**Mr. McClellan:** Why do you suppose it was that the interministry report on residential services was so critical about the lack of personal support services in Ontario, if everything is as rosy as you say it is?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** Because that report was initiated in 1974-75 and so a lot of—

**Mr. McClellan:** So you say we have solved these problems in the intervening two years?

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** No, I don't suggest we've solved the problems, but I do suggest we are attempting to solve them. Certainly the funding has been increased, as I pointed out to you, a great deal over a two-year period.

**Mr. McClellan:** I'm disappointed that you think you're making attempts to deal constructively and adequately with this problem because I have every sense that you're not.

Again, the schematic diagram I sent over to you that Dr. Skoll developed, which is based on his observations of adequate geriatric service systems currently in place in Great Britain and most of the northern European countries, (a) stressed the need for that array of social services being available on a home basis, (b) assumes the need to integrate, in a structural way, health and social services, and (c) implies the need to have established, at the local community level, some kind of co-ordinating group that can hold the array of services together around the needs of each and every person, and do the kind of planning on a comprehensive basis for each community around the community-based geriatric services needed for the particular community.

We don't have those. We don't even have the possibilities, at this point in time, of setting up that kind of a service system.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I think I did suggest to you earlier that we have addressed ourselves to this particular report, along with many



others, in looking to the needs of services for senior citizens in this province. I also indicated to you that there would be policy forthcoming. Consideration is being given at the moment to what direction that policy will take, perhaps in the form of a green paper but perhaps not. But to suggest that nothing is being addressed, that nothing is being done, is not quite true.

**Mr. McClellan:** You've had the interministerial report since April 1975. I wouldn't think it would take two full calendar years, given the severity of the condemnation—or the criticism, if you want to use a milder term—but given the severity of the criticism in that report, for you to have developed a policy and got the policy in place. It's not as though you don't have the staff available.

I worked with Lawrence Crawford when I was in the ministry. I know he is one of the most confident and knowledgeable gerontologists anywhere in this country and that he's done the work and has the knowledge and the capacity to advise government with respect to the establishment of an adequate geriatric care service system if that's what government wanted to do. The problem doesn't lie at the staff level because the staff has every capability of dealing with it; the problem lies at the policy level and the failure of government to set its priorities straight and to direct its staff to develop these programmes. So now we're floundering into a policy development phase two years after the overwhelming evidence of critical failure has been presented to you. If you think that's adequate, that's pathetic.

**Hon. Mrs. Birch:** I obviously take quite a great deal of exception to the comments you've just made. I think that you, above all else being involved in the field of social work, would appreciate that many of the problems we are facing today in the provision of residential services for seniors and children are as a result of too much haste into getting into programmes. I think you would appreciate the desirability of being very cautious about the direction in which we go to ensure that same thing doesn't happen again.

**Mr. McClellan:** Two years is not unduly hasty to develop an adequate and comprehensive social service plan.

Let me remind you of something. The Seebohm committee in Great Britain, which presented a blueprint for the total reorganization of the social service delivery system, away from institutional care and towards personal and family support services at the local level, if I remember my dates correctly, was

commissioned in 1968, reported in 1969, by 1970 the implementation was well under way, and by 1972 and 1973 the main components of the system were in place. That's for an entire nation.

We're talking about a province of six or seven million people. There's absolutely no excuse for this kind of idiotic delay process. So don't ask me to be sympathetic at this point in time because it's not warranted. You have delayed and procrastinated. You have sat on this report. You have suppressed this report. It has now become available and we have the testimony of your own officials to bear witness to our own intuitions and concerns that we pick up as representatives and from people who are working in the field. It's not good enough. I'm not reassured by the process that has been initiated with respect to the other major critical area, which is the area of children's services.

We haven't had a coherent presentation of social policy with a series of coherent options that might be available to us. What we have is an exercise in flying by the seat of our pants and some nice public relations initiatives. I expect that with respect to services to the elderly we'll get the same treatment. We'll get a lot of high-flown rhetoric about the need to move away from residential and institutional care and towards adequate personal support services. But we won't have the kind of coherent planning document that can then be used as the basis for the development of an adequate network of services and the development of adequate programmes, and of adequate funding arrangements so that we can get an adequate social services system for the elderly in place.

We'll get more of these election gimcracks, like the home help employment service, which outrages me. It outrages me that you can talk seriously about setting a home help programme in place piecemeal, ad hoc, as part of a temporary employment strategy paying \$20 a day. If that's the kind of priority you accord to the vital work of providing essential services to the elderly, a kind of hastily conceived and inadequately funded home help employment programme for the youth, it is tragic. What it means is that we are locked into further years of unnecessary institutional incarceration of the elderly.

Nothing can be more brutal because of inadequacies in income maintenance and social service programmes, than to force people into institutions, force them out of their homes, force them to break their ties with the community and force them to go behind the cold and inhuman walls of institutions.

It is all so unnecessary. We know what to do. It's been done in other jurisdictions. Dr. Skoll has given a skeleton outline of the kinds of components of a care system that already works. It is already in place. It is already keeping people out of institutions. Ontario is still looking at policy alternatives and looking at maybe producing a green paper, and maybe nobody will ask too many questions about

the home help programme and the \$20-a-day service. It just won't do. It's just pathetic. It's a real disservice to the people of this province.

**Mr. Chairman:** Does anyone else have any questions to ask?

The committee adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

## CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Social Development Policy programme: Social Development Policy, Social Development Councils, Youth Secretariat and Youth Experience .....	S-55
Adjournment .....	S-92

## SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)  
 Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)  
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)  
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)  
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)  
 Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)  
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)  
 Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)  
 Shore, M.; Chairman (London North PC)  
 Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)